THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCIX.] JULY, 1861. [Vol. XVII.

M. RENAN ON THE RELIGIOUS FUTURE OF MODERN SOCIETIES.

[We are enabled to offer our readers a translation, from a recent No. of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, of a very remarkable essay from the pen of M. Renan, whose name appeared in our pages in connection with the French version of the Life of Dr. Channing, and as one of the contributors to the volume on "The Progress of Religious Thought," noticed in our last No. Of this essay the *Saturday Review* said, "The Revue des Deux Mondes, although it always discusses very varied subjects with great honesty and great ability, has not produced any article for many months which can be compared with M. Renan's essay on the *Religious Future of Modern Societies*. He treats of the position and prospects of the three main divisions of the Christian world with singular largeness, candour and originality. Perhaps the ordinary English reader might not quite like what he reads. He might receive with pleasure the very decided opinion expressed by one of the first of oriental scholars, that the religions of Asia are destined to fade away before the only religion that has true vitality, but he might be reluctant to pursue the train of argument by which M. Renan attempts to establish the improbability of the fusion of Christian sects. But the use of an article like this, written by a great biblical and oriental scholar, is not to win agreement, but to provoke thought." The titles of the works prefixed to the article are—1. Paris, Rome et Jerusalem, ou la Question Religieuse au Dix-neuvième Siècle, par M. I. Salvador, Paris, 1860. 2. Du Protestantisme en France, par Samuel Vincent, avec une Introduction de M. Prevost-Paradol, Paris, 1859. 3. La Liberté Religieuse et la Legislation Actuelle, Paris, 1860.]

There are many amongst the reputed wise of our day who have framed for themselves a singular system. Persuaded that universal peace is the supreme good, they maintain that whatever is calculated to produce division of opinion amongst men should be prevented by the state, and they close their eyes upon all questions likely to disturb their happy quietude. China is the ideal they unconsciously propose to themselves. There every man has his official epithet, and each is entitled after death to the consideration he enjoyed in his lifetime: every magistrate in China is honest, every *prêfet* a good administrator, the kings are all fathers; and if they were not, no man dares say so. We are told that when the old sages discovered any trace of crimes committed by their sovereigns, they carefully destroyed it. In this way China appears at first sight to be a paradise of sages;

and the 18th century, that seriously credited these beatific absurdities of the Chinese annals, thought they had found the model people. In reality, China, with its mandarins, its admirable police, its competitive examinations, its widely-diffused public instruction, has always been inferior to our West even in its worst days. When we burned men on the ground of theological subtleties, we most assuredly were far from that state of rational indifference about things transcendental which, in the eyes of a follower of Confucius, is an essential condition of happiness. But a race must be judged by its whole history. China, in consequence of this persistent optimism, is dying out, not from old age, but from an indefinitely prolonged childhood; while the Western nations, with their burning thirst for the *absolute*, for right, with their inquisitions, their revolutionary tribunals, their reign of terror, are still young and mistresses of the world. Capable of loving much and hating much, they owe even to their excesses the experience that in their past there is much to condemn, and in their future a high ideal to pursue. For them, the words Faith and Hope have a meaning. They are a dogmatic race, and are wont to hold many things dearer than life, and are possessed of an invincible reliance on what they believe to be the truth.

What the superficial politicians of the last century and of the early part of the present found most to admire in the institutions of China, was the prudent obscurity in which all questions pertaining to religion were kept by the legislature. A species of academy of moral sciences regulating once for all man's relations with the Infinite, a central power extending a prudent prohibition over all questions likely to excite men's thoughts and to lead to discussion, a religion of ceremonies and parade,—such appeared to them the consummation of a wise administration. Persuaded that enjoyment is the great aim of life, they regarded as a bugbear the intrusion of all problems of a higher order. Luther and Calvin were held to be mischievous men who had provoked much bloodshed. Pilate narrowly escaped being reproached with weakness, and the Roman police with want of vigilance in guarding the sepulchre. All propagandism was a crime; and one of the organic articles of the *Concordat* enjoins that no preacher shall in his instructions attack directly or indirectly any other form of worship authorized by the State. Very decided reactions, and apparently in opposite senses, prove that this narrow tendency of some minds is not the tendency of Europe, and that the West will never resign itself to live, for the sake of peace, without motives for living. The struggle may assume ever-changing aspects, and parties will, we hope, abandon the disloyal weapons they have too often employed, but the battle must be waged to the last. Then in what form will be invested that eternal discord whose germs God himself has

planted in the heart of humanity? If religion has a future, what is that future? How are we to limit without extinguishing the central fire that all living society bears in its bosom? How modify the proportions of the religious families into which the world is partitioned?

Some recent works have called attention to these points. A writer, M. Salvador, long known for his bold originality, has just published one of the most remarkable works that has appeared for years upon religious questions. M. Prevost-Paradol, a young and brilliant writer, whose noble heart sympathizes with everything that is generous, has likewise brought out a new edition of a work, first published thirty years ago, by one of those men of the past generation who had the clearest presentiment of the future. M. Prevost-Paradol's Introduction abounds in reflections, pregnant with force and sagacity, upon the present state of the different religious communions. An anonymous writer also exposes with remarkable vigour the consequences of our present legislation regarding worship, and shews what is really to be understood by religious liberty. Finally, contemporary events shew how inextricably mixed up religious questions are with the progress of the world, how the politician must make his account with them, and how utterly insufficient are the maxims hitherto acted on, in presence of the events that each day is producing. We shall endeavour to see if we are authorized in deriving from all these facts some light upon the possible transformation of the religious code of humanity.

1. The first question that presents itself when we reflect upon the religious future of the modern world, is this,—May we expect that a new religious form will appear, which shall be the complete and original expression of the wants of modern times, or will these wants seek their own satisfaction by modifying the existing forms of worship? In other words, outside Judaism, Christianity and Islamism, will another religion be founded, having no more connection with these three than had Jesus with Moses, and Mahomet with Jesus? This problem is treated with singular relief in the work by M. Salvador. Equally removed from the orthodoxy which in one of the three religions confines itself to symbols, and from free symbolism, which goes on interpreting in an ever finer sense,—from deism, which retains but the dried skeleton,—and from criticism, which only seeks to seize the import and value of religion in the sum-total of the progress of humanity,—M. Salvador occupies a distinct place in the religious world of our time. If, as many think, the malady of our time is that we are too historical, M. Salvador of his contemporaries is the most exempt from the common infirmity. A nature original, massive, imbued with the spirit of his race, caring little to amuse, indifferent about our minute diversities of opinion, about our historical scruples,—a stranger to that fine intuition of

the past which German criticism has inaugurated,—M. Salvador is a religious innovator; without a complete knowledge of things, he associates and combines freely. His place should have been in the 16th century in Holland, with the Spinozas and Acostas; but falling on an age of analysis, I fear he will remain a sterile apparition. M. Salvador was the first in France to approach the problem of the origin of Christianity. He did so with insufficient erudition, but with a lively sentiment of some of the data of the problem. If we may permit ourselves to say so, he brings to his task one of the gifts of his race, a kind of political *coup-d'œil*, which renders the Semitic race alone capable of great religious combinations. This race seizes the great outlines of human affairs, not as we do by analysis and the profound study of details, but by a synthetic view, such as that of Elijah on Mount Carmel. The philosophy of history is a Jewish work; and, in one sense, the last transformation of the prophetic spirit, prophecy at the time of the Seleucides becoming apocalyptic vision, and apocalyptic vision, such as we find it for the first time in the unknown author of the book of Daniel, being the immediate antecedent of the Abbé Joachim, of Bossuet, of Vico and of Herder. When we become acquainted with the philosophy of the history of the Mussulmans through the *Prolégomènes* of Ibn-Khaldoun, translated by M. de Slane, we shall be surprised at the grand, comprehensive views which those Unitarian religions inspired long before any idea of an exact science of history was developed. Abd-el-Kader, in our day, possesses in the highest degree this faculty of his race. He is the prophet of the latter days of the Semitic race, the Jeremiah of Islamism. M. Salvador at times appears to me in an analogous light. If we seek exactness and positivism, we shall find him, on the contrary, eccentric and often puerile. His combinations, although deeply imbued with the abstract imagination so characteristic of the Jews, are often arbitrary, and remind us of Philo and the Kabbale. His style, admirable when sustained by some brilliant flash of inspiration, is often unequal and harsh; but we must bear in mind that the first condition of fruitful combinations is merely approximation. Had Mahomet known how to read, and had the Bible been known directly by himself, he could not have so successfully amalgamated Christianity and Judaism. The religious combination of the future, supposing that the future does reserve something unforeseen for us in this respect, will certainly not be the work of critics or theologians. Ardent minds, seeing things through the veil of their own passionate dreams, are the fittest instruments for this task. M. Salvador is unquestionably the man of our day whose conceptions of a religious renovation take the widest range,—at times reminding us of Saint Paul by the fervour of his soul, his ardour for religious revolution, the ease with which he moves in the midst of confusion. A mediocre

historian, he surpasses us all in practical insight into religious matters. We are, for the most part, too Christian not to have some prejudice in religion arising from attachment, from habit or sympathy.

M. Salvador is, as regards ourselves, what the Jews must have appeared to the Pagans of Greece and Rome,—an unbeliever, a man without traditions, a scoffer of the gods. What original vivacity in his account of his religious vocation! What prophet of Israel more boldly affirmed the future of his race? "Come forward, they say to the Jew, and declare to us thy name! My name? My name is Jew, a word signifying *praiser, invariable celebrator* of the Being, of the Alone, of the Eternal. Thy age? My age? Two thousand years more than Jesus Christ's. Thy profession? I cast aside the miserable professions made for me, and of which I still exhibit too deeply the impress and the consequences; but my destiny, my traditional profession, is this,—I guarantee the holy imprescriptibility of the name of the law. I am the living conservator of the ancient nobility and of the legitimacy attached by right divine to the name of the people. Raise your hand and promise to speak without fear or hatred—to say the truth, the whole truth. I know by science sure, that, notwithstanding its admirable grandeur, Rome is a usurping city, that it is not the true Jerusalem. For the universal glory of God as well as in the positive interest of the world, Rome must be providentially transformed, must be sovereignly replaced. I know by certain science that the divinity of Jesus Christ must be radically modified or openly rectified in a holy and large measure. After having rendered to the people what belongs to the people, render to the Eternal what belongs to HIM alone. I likewise know and have long known that the other nations must break new bread, inaugurate the true rest, the true sabbath of the Eternal, and celebrate a new Easter. This is my free testimony. Moreover, the things that I know by the spirit of tradition, by the spirit of justice and understanding, those things I will by an inflexible will, and they will come to pass through the spirit of moral force, by supreme necessity and divine authority."

All that has been done great in the world, has been done in the name of exaggerated hopes, and there are features in the Jewish character so singular, that we can never speak lightly of them. Still the past of some nations is so glorious, that it excludes all thought of a future. How speak of the future of Athens? What destiny for Greece would be other than obscure compared with what it once was? For the same reason, in speaking of the Jews, we can only think of what they have done. To my mind, the Jews, since Christ, have been only useful as the conservators of one book. Since the day they handed over the Hebrew Bible to European science, since the day they taught

Luther and Buxtorf the Hebrew tongue, since that day their mission has ended. They have, no doubt, produced a remarkable proportion of eminent men; but this privilege they share with all small sects, which by the force of circumstances become aristocracies easily permeated by light, and into which routine and prejudice quickly find their way.

While admiring, quite as much as M. Salvador does, the rôle of the Jews in the past, I cannot share his opinions upon the part he attributes to them in the future. There will be, I believe, a reform of Christianity, but it will not consist in a return to Judaism. Generally speaking, M. Salvador does not form to himself a sufficient idea of the strong originality of Christianity, regarded as a whole. I persist in believing that Christianity is not a continuation of Judaism, but a reaction against the domineering spirit of Judaism wrought out in the heart of Judaism itself. Whatever may have been the views of its founder on this point, we cannot but acknowledge that in the attitude of Saint Paul, and still more in the direction taken by the primitive church, there was nothing ambiguous. Judaism supplied the leaven that occasioned the fermentation, but that fermentation went beyond its limits. First the Hellenic and Roman element, then the Celtic and Germanic element prevailed; and, taking to themselves exclusive possession of Christianity, they developed it in a sense altogether different from its first direction. Schleiermacher and the Catholic school of Munich,—M. Lassauly, for instance,—are right when they declare that Socrates and Plato are more truly our ancestors and nearer Jesus Christ than the rude Bedouins of the time of Joshua and David, or the Jews of the Pharisaic lineage, with their narrow, scornful, exclusive spirit. M. Bunsen is right when he says that the progressive development and perfecting of Christianity will depend upon the gradual elimination of all Judaic elements, and the complete assimilation of the Indo-European genius. Yet would it be unjust to overlook the eminent service rendered to humanity by the Jewish and Arab races, in boldly cutting through the labyrinth of ancient mythologies; still this was but a negative service, whose full value was wrought out by virtue of the excellence of the European races. Islamism fell on a less fertile soil, and has, on the whole, been more pernicious than useful to mankind; its dryness and utter simplicity stifled every other growth. Christianity escaped this danger, for the reason that the Semitic element in it always met with resistance, and is now nearly expelled.

In consequence of his Jewish tendencies, M. Salvador's mode of judging religious questions is marked by its absolute tone. He is unjust towards Protestantism, because he does not see it hold forth pretensions to divine right in all things. Nor can he comprehend the future of free Christianity such as the Germans conceive it; he does not allow sufficient weight to England and

the United States, and appears not to be conscious of the extension of the Anglo-Saxon race over the globe. The separation of the spiritual and temporal, of which the Jews and Mussulmans had but a slender idea, and which has been the salvation of Christian Europe, M. Salvador admits with some reserve. He hopes (may Heaven preserve us from it!) that the day may come when they will be one and identical. A certain theocratic tendency pierces out here and there. Here, again, M. Salvador proves himself a true Semite. The two principal forms of Semitic civilization have this common feature, that they do not admit civil government in the sense that we understand it. In the eyes of the Jew and Arab, power is always derived from God. This deplorable system has handed the Mussulmans over to despotism without one shadow of guarantee or safeguard, and has created the frightful state of society which Islamism presents for the last six or seven hundred years.

Theocracy, in attributing a spiritual origin to power, is pleasing to some elevated minds, but it contains a hidden poison that must render it for ever fatal: the power it can alone produce is absolute power. The Germanic principle, that power in its different degrees is the property of the party exercising it, however mean in appearance, is in reality far better, because, viewed in this light, all becomes personal right; every man has his own charter, each is king in his own fortress. One thing is at least certain, that it is this notion alone that has succeeded in founding liberty in the world. This is the grand difference that separates us liberals from M. Salvador. He would unite and found; he demands a spiritual power with a symbol and an established dogma. We, on the other hand, would have each individual find his own symbol, and are suspicious of such unions, believing them impediments to liberty. In common with all exalted natures, M. Salvador aspires after unity. We, on the contrary, believe that division is the condition of liberty; and were it in the power of an individual to fuse into one all nations, churches, sects, schools, we should say, Nay. Unity was fatal to the old Roman world; diversity will be the salvation of the modern world. M. Salvador invites the age to turn its eyes to the East and South. We say to the age, look to the North and West. The East never produced anything so good as we are. What is there of the Jew in our Germanic and Celtic Christianity, in Saint François d'Assise, in Saint Gertrude, Saint Bernard, Saint Elizabeth, and more recently in Vincent de Paul, Schleiermacher, Channing? Is it to these flowers that have blossomed in the breeze of our romantic mountains and seas, that you compare your Esthers and Mordecais? Is there anything of the Jew in the book of the *Imitation*, in the monastic life, this capital element of Christianity, in our saints of the Merovingian epoch, our true saints? Let us remain Germans and Celts; let us keep our *eternal gospel*, our

Christianity, such as our cold and robust nature has made it. All that is good in humanity is grafted on it, all moral progress is identified with it. A kind of innate crudity, like an original sin, marks the races and countries that have not passed through this excellent discipline. Christianity is thus become almost synonymous with *religion*. All efforts made outside the bounds of this great and good Christian tradition must be sterile. Jesus based religion on humanity, as Socrates did philosophy, and Aristotle science. There was philosophy before Socrates, and science before Aristotle. Since Socrates and Aristotle, philosophy and science have made immense progress, but all has been built on the foundations they laid. In the same way, before Jesus, religious thought passed through many revolutions. Since Jesus, it has made vast conquests, yet it has never gone beyond the essential idea that Jesus created. He determined for ever the idea of pure religion; and all that has since been built, has been built upon his foundation. The religion of Jesus in this sense is not limited. The church has had its epochs and its phases; it has shut itself up in symbols which have had, and ever will have, but a temporary value. Jesus founded absolute religion, excluding nothing, determining nothing; his symbols are not fixed dogmas, but images capable of indefinite expansion. It would be in vain that we should seek for one theological proposition in the Gospels. All professions of faith are thus treason to the idea of Jesus, just as the scholastic system of the middle ages, in proclaiming Aristotle sole master of a complete science, betrayed Aristotle. Had Aristotle been present at the discussions of the schools, he would have repudiated this narrow interpretation, he would have taken part with progressive science against routine, he would have joined his contradictions of the 16th and 17th centuries. In like manner, if Jesus watches over the destinies of the work he founded, we may be sure he is not with those who pretend to limit it within the narrow bounds of a few phrases of a catechism, but with those who labour to continue it.

Eternal glory belongs to him, in all orders of greatness, who laid the corner-stone of progress. In the works of Aristotle there may not be a word bearing on the modern physical sciences, on meteorology, &c., yet he is not the less the founder of the science of nature. Whatever may be the transformations that the dogma shall undergo, Jesus will ever continue to be the creator of the pure sentiment of religion: the Sermon on the Mount will never be surpassed. Let us here observe that the *fact* is of little importance, the biography of secondary interest,—in such matters the *idea* is everything. Suppose we dug up to-morrow a document shewing that the personal esteem felt for Socrates, Aristotle, Descartes, was exaggerated,—that they were not the authors of the writings attributed to them,—we would nevertheless continue to be Aristotelians and Cartesiens. The

proper name, in this instance, is but the mark of origin, the exactness of which is only important to the scholar. No discovery, nor no system, can prevent us attaching ourselves to the great intellectual and moral race, at the head of which shines, rightly or wrongly, the name of Jesus. In this sense we are Christians, even though we should be divided upon almost all points of the Christian tradition that has preceded us. The religious question of the future is thus much limited. Our civilization will not give birth to any great religious creation that shall be completely original.

Attempts in the style of Saint-Simonism are founded on a misunderstanding, the name of religion being applied to things distinct from religion, such as the distribution of wealth, industry, &c. But where shall we find in all this, scope for abnegation, for devotion, for the sacrifice of the real to the ideal, which is the essence itself of religion? The attempts of the revolutionary school are not less erroneous. The revolution itself is altogether a profane fact—its last word, the *code civil*. If America still contains within herself sufficient ignorance and energy of nature to give birth to one of these singular movements, whose sole title to credit is that it resisted the sarcasms of two or three generations, it may be affirmed that the surrounding rationalism will be strong enough to prevent such movements doubling the Cape, after which blind faith becomes tradition; their hold would fail them. Christianity, then, alone remains in possession of the future; but Christianity implies a whole world. In order to form an idea of its future revolutions, we must study its present condition, and the proportion of the parties which profess it.

2. At all times Christianity has been divided. The product of three centuries of absolutely individual efforts, it found the principle of its force in this very division, and in the extreme activity produced by division. The primitive organization of the church was in some degree municipal, each church existing by itself, and all the churches corresponding by means of epistles and recognized envoys. True, the churches only continued the vast system of synagogues that covered the empire at the time of Augustus, and which has been continued by the Jews nearly up to modern times. The life of the Jewish communities in the middle ages, and even in our days, in those countries where Judaism has preserved its original organization, is the type of what went on in the churches at the time of Saint Paul, Saint Ignatius, Saint Ironia: the same rivalry, the same cabals, the same vigilance regarding questions of doctrine, discipline and hierarchy. *The churches* were the pioneers of *the Church*, and when the latter, becoming official, endeavoured to mould itself on the unity of the Empire, division sought for itself another outlet: a rationalistic opposition party, the Arians, sprung up, and for more than a century balanced the orthodox church. As

soon as this type of Christianity, which was too much in advance of the age, disappeared, to emerge again after the lapse of a thousand years, another opposition, deeper, because founded on a difference of race, took its place. This division in the church followed the division of the two great races of the ancient world. What Imperial Rome failed to do, Christian Rome failed to accomplish. In the same way that the Latin tongue, at the moment that it was extending its conquests even into Scotland and Ireland, stopped at Naples before the Greek race in the south of Italy, so the Roman Church was powerless before the Greek Church. Photius was only the instrument of an historical necessity; the separation existed since the time of Constantine. These two branches of Christianity continued their propagandism all through the middle ages,—the Latin assimilating the Germanic races, the Greek church the Slavonic. The struggle for empire between the two churches was long; the Greek Church, superior in culture to the Latin Church until the 10th or 11th* century, soon became inferior to it as a moral force. Islamism crushed it; the slaves whom it had affiliated were tardy in development. The Latin Church in the 16th century gained an immense ascendancy. This ascendancy ended in a schism. The great Christian outburst, Protestantism, was produced in the Latin Church. The force, depth and liberty of the Teutonic genius broke forth. This genius, which had borne reluctantly the yoke of Rome, now claimed its rights, and created a Christianity in harmony with itself, which after much groping arrived, towards the end of the 18th and the 19th century, at a religious height hitherto unknown. Germany at this period realizes the most perfect religion that has as yet been professed, and ever bears the name of Christianity. Thus, by the side of the two old orthodoxies, Greek and Latin, a new form of Christianity manifests itself, whose ultimate consequence, *free* Christianity, is the product of our time. Three powers, for ever destined to combat, without the possibility of annihilating or even enfeebling each other, still less of uniting, divide Christianity, and whilst preserving it from all exclusive domination, secure its future, and, I venture to say, likewise the future of philosophy and liberty. This triple division of the Christian family is not, like Arianism, Pelagianism, &c., a simple division of sects; it corresponds to natural divisions, such as in the civilized world mark the separation of the Latin, Germanic and Greco-slave races. Should England allow itself to be seduced by Dr. Pusey's shallow criti-

* The first half of the Latin middle ages produced no man equal to Photius in learning and intellect. In the 12th and 13th centuries, the West gained the superiority,—no Byzantine was found to compete with Abelard and Roger Bacon. Again, in the 14th and 15th century, the Greeks are our masters,—to them is due in a great measure the Italian renaissance. Plethon and Manuel Paleologus were the most cultivated men of their time.

cisms, still England would not be reconciled to the Pope. Should the Greek and Latin theologians come to an understanding upon the *filioque*, still Rome would not reign at Moscow. The inutility of the efforts that these three Churches have made to absorb each other is henceforth demonstrated. In the middle ages, the Latin Church weighed upon the Greek Church, and upon the small oriental churches, which may be counted as annexes of the Greek Church, with all the weight of her military superiority. Since the 16th century, she still weighs upon them with the weight of her diplomacy, and the importance that her exclusive possession of Poland gives her amongst the Slavonic race. She detaches whole branches, Armenians, Maronites, Greeks. The Turks inflict upon the Greek Church an apparently mortal blow, when, behold, at the end of four or five hundred years, the Greek Church resuscitates. A conquest, which for ages appeared of small importance, that of the Russians, confers upon the Greek Church a chief equal to that of the Latins. The imaginative and more enduring Slavonics are substituted for the enfeebled Greeks, and after the expiration of ten centuries the work of Photius appears again as one of the leading phenomena of the world.

Protestantism proved itself not less obstinate: Philip II., Pius V., the Duke of Alba, the Jesuits, Louis XIV., all failed. The heresy they proclaimed to be exterminated still reigns mistress of some of the most vital parts of Europe. Nothing, then, will come of the internecine struggle between the three Christian families; their equilibrium is not less certain than that of the three great races that possess the globe. Their division will save the future from the excesses of a too preponderating religious power, as the division of Europe must for ever prevent the return of the *orbis romanus*, the closed circle, from which there was no refuge possible against the formidable tyranny that unity always engenders. Will the propagandism of these three great Churches in the non-christianized portions of the world change in any degree their relative situations? In other words, what is the future of the Catholic, the Greco-Russian and Protestant missions? Long experience permits the expression of an opinion upon this point. There are few self-sacrifices so worthy of respect as that of the missionary. Few institutions can render or have rendered such services to historical and geographical sciences as the propaganda establishments. If in our day the Protestant missions have almost the monopoly of this noble *rôle*, in consequence of the unfortunate indifference to science too often exhibited by the Catholic missionaries, we must not forget the admirable Catholic missions of the 18th century—those of the Jesuits in China, the Italian missionaries in India and Thibet, the Horace della Pennas, the Pauline de Saint Bartholomews, the Tieffenthaler. Nevertheless, from the point of view of reli-

gious revolutions, *missions* have always been a secondary fact in the history of humanity. This mode of isolated and individual action, which is that of all great founders and apostles, and which we find at the origin of all religions, is insufficient when the first fire of creation is passed. Saint Paul, in our days, would not become a missionary. Not one serious Christian community can be cited as the work of modern missions. The churches of China and Japan were built on sand. Neither the heroism of François Xavier, nor the ability and intelligence of the Jesuits, could save them from crumbling to pieces. The efforts to undermine the great religions of Asia, Islamism, Brahminism, Buddhism, the lettered religion of China, have all been fruitless. Nor is it towards Christianity that Africa seems disposed to turn. At the present moment, by a singular coincidence, it is turning from one end to the other to Islamism. As to the savage races, these sad survivors of a world in its infancy, for whom our best wish is that they may die a gentle death, it is derision to apply to them our dogmatic formulas. Before making them Christians, we should first make them men, and it is doubtful that we should succeed. The poor Otaheitan is forced to church or sermon; and since we cannot correct the incurable softness of his brain, we make him die of melancholy and ennui. Oh! leave this last remnant of the sons of nature to die out on their mother's bosom—interrupt not with our austere dogmas, the fruit of twenty centuries' reflection, their childish sports, their dances in the moonlight, their gentle intoxication of an hour. The great error of the Jesuits, the idea that the education of man is to be done externally by artificial processes and by pious machinery, is at the bottom of all missionary labours. They created Paraguays and childish gewgaws, and thought they had revived Eden.

Does this imply that all hope of aggrandizement is at an end for Christianity? Certainly not. If we compare the geographical area of Christianity in the year 1500 with that of the present day, we shall be struck by its vast increase; but this increase is not due to missions, but due to the propagation of the European race—in other words, to conquest and colonization. Conquest and colonization contain the whole secret of the future destiny of Christianity. Let us see which of the three Christian communions has in this respect the fairest prospects. It cannot be denied that Protestantism here presents itself with a certain superiority; the colonizing nations are almost all Protestants. Protestantism, by its individualizing tendency, the simplicity of its apparatus, the absence of all necessity to communicate with the rest of Christianity, seems pre-eminently to be the religion of the colonist. In his Bible the Englishman finds, in remote Oceanica, the religious aliment which the Catholic can only receive through a whole establishment of bishops and priests. "Out of ten men," says M. Prevost-Paradol, "who with hatchet

and rifle in hand advance into unexplored solitudes, and who there establish their dwellings which presently expand into cities, who settle there with families that by and by form a state, hardly one belongs to the Roman Church, and he, if he does not quit it himself, seldom retains his children in it."* Consequently, the most fruitful conquests Christianity has made have been for the benefit of Protestantism. The United States, Australia, Dutch India, the Cape of Good Hope, Hindostan and China, have likewise received good Protestant seed. Almost all Oceanica seems destined to become Protestant; and, what is still more important, these rich deposits of the Anglo-Saxon race scattered at the other end of the world are colonizing and fructifying in their turn with admirable fecundity. The results of this silent conquest are incalculable. But we should deceive ourselves were we to imagine that in this partition of the earth amongst the race of Japhet, the two orthodox Churches, following in the career of policy, had not very important conquests to achieve. Accordingly we see Russia gaining proselytes to the Greek Church amongst the tribes of the north and centre of Asia, and it appears likely to be through this medium that the Buddhist populations will be welded into Christianity. These conquests are going on without any violence, and conducted with much tact, and it is most probable that China will receive from the same quarter the Christian element in the form most appropriate to her necessities. Some small schismatic Christian communities of the East—for example, the Armenians—seem also destined to re-attach themselves to the Greek Church, when their present isolation shall have ceased. Thus we see the immense surface that has devolved upon that Christian family which at one moment seemed condemned to perish.

As to Catholicism, if its colonial future seems less brilliant than that of Protestantism, we must not confine ourselves to this exclusive view. Assuredly, Spanish and Portuguese America, Canada, the Philippines, are not equivalent to the United States and Australia; but along the coast of the Mediterranean Rome may make important conquests. For the Church to which the majority of Frenchmen belongs, there is surely reserved many unforeseen and glorious chances. The Christian schools and charitable establishments which the zeal of French Catholicism has founded in the East, in order to fill up the frightful gaps in the heart of Islamism, these surely have a future. Besides, there is another element which Catholicism is better able to grapple with than Protestantism, or even than the Greco-Russian Church —the small floating Christian communities, such as the Abyssi-

* It is estimated that if the Catholics who have emigrated to the United States had remained faithful to their creed, they would form a population of 7,500,000 souls. Now there are only two millions of Catholics in the United States, notwithstanding the annexation of Texas and California.

nians, Copts, Syrians, Armenians, which the disasters of the Greek Church have prevented her from assimilating;—the traditional pomp of Rome gives her advantages with these churches, and she often successfully disputes them with Russia. The fidelity she has inspired the Maronites with, and the advantages she thence derives, are remarkable facts. The abstract mode in which Protestantism approaches these populations is not in general (with the exception of the admirable American mission of the Nestorians of Armenia) calculated to promote success amongst Christians of this low scale.

But this is all from a secular point of view; let us take the higher stand of conscience, and ask the three great Christian communions with what programme they are prepared to respond to the requirements of modern society, and what compromise they are prepared to make between tradition and the new wants of the human mind.

(To be continued.)

PRAYER TO CHRIST IN UNITARIAN WORSHIP.

Sir,

In introducing to your readers the subject of hymns as employed in our Unitarian worship, I have to do with a matter of fact, namely, Do certain alleged hymns, or do they not, contain prayer to Christ, yea or nay? If certain hymns do contain prayer to Christ, ought they to be employed in our Unitarian worship? Of the fact, any well-taught member of our churches is competent to judge. It is not less easy to give an answer to the second question. The fact is not set aside by a simple denial, such as Mr. Martineau gives (p. 216). Nor is the fact set aside by pleading for apostrophe. On that point there is no dispute. As little is the usage justified by pleading for poetic licence, for no licence of poetry can be admitted as against scriptural truth. Equally futile is all appeal to the authority of sentiment, for sentiment is but a subordinate power. A claim on behalf of "intermediate kind of affection toward immortal natures" does not justify prayer to Christ; while it looks very like the graduated worship paid to the saints and angels of the Roman calendar, as contrasted with the worship paid to God and Christ and "Mary the Mother of God." Of this graduated worship I find the following authoritative account in Perrone:* "Cultus nomine venit honor ille qui Deo tribuitur, aut creaturis Dei intuitu ac respectu defertur. Variis porro vocabulis honor iste designatur, adorationis, videlicet, respectus, venerationis, reverentiæ, servitutis; quæ quidem denominationes aut synonymæ sunt, aut saltem

* Prelectiones Theologicæ, Parisiis, 1842, I. p. 1155.

indiscriminatim in vulgari sermone usurpantur. Licet vero promiscue voces istæ adhibeantur, non unus tamen idemque est cultus vel honor, qui Creatori ac creaturis defertur; enim cum honor sit signum et testimonium quoddam illius excellentiæ, quæ est in honorato, inde fit ut pro diversitate ejusmodi excellentiæ diversus pariter sit honor vel cultus quem Deo vel creaturis tribuimus. Deo nempe utpote supremo rerum omnium Domino cultum supremum deferimus, creaturis vero nonnisi propter Deum seu in ordine ad Deum dictum honorem impendimus. Sequitur nonnisi Deo proprie convenire cultum, honorem, adorationem. Duplex proinde inprimis distinguitur cultus, latriæ atque duliæ; quæ voces quamvis pariter servitutem significent, cum tamen earum prior referatur ad subjectum seu ad ipsos colentes, qui adoratione Deo propriam servitutem ac dependentiam profitentur, posterior vero ad objectum quod colitur, sanctos scilicet, qui Dei servi sunt, rite ad utriusque cultus genus significandum usurpantur. Duliæ cultus bifariam rursum dividitur, in simplicem nempe duliæ cultum, et in cultum hyperduliæ, quo beata Virgo speciali ratione honoratur præ sanctis cæteris, quos illa meritis ac dignitate longe antecellit." "That honour which is paid to God or which is offered to creatures, the eye being directed to God, is known by the name of worship. This honour is designated by various terms—namely, adoration, respect, veneration, reverence, service (homage), which denominations are synonymous, or at least are used indiscriminately, in the vulgar tongue. But though the words are employed promiscuously, yet the worship is not one and the same which is given to the Creator and to creatures; for since honour is a sign and testimony of the excellence which exists in the being honoured, the honour or worship which is paid to God and to creatures is correspondingly different according to the diversity of that excellence. To God only, as being the supreme Lord of all things, we offer supreme worship; while we pay the said honour to creatures only on account of God or in order with due regard to God. *It follows that to God alone worship, honour, adoration,* PROPERLY *belong.* Worship is of two kinds. Of these, the one is called latria, the other dulia. Though both the words denote service (or homage), yet as the former refers to the subject or the worshipers themselves, who by their adoration acknowledge to God their service and dependence, while the latter refers to the object worshiped, the saints for instance, who are God's servants, they are correctly employed to denote *the two kinds of worship. Dulia itself, however, has two divisions; there is simple dulia and hyper-dulia. The latter is that by which the blessed Virgin is honoured above the other saints, whom she far excels in merit and dignity.*" The passage is a comment and a warning. It is a comment on Mr. Martineau's speculations. It is also a warning on the tendency of those speculations. When men begin to construct their own

worship, they end by worshiping the creature, first together with, and then instead of, the Creator. Mr. Martineau prepares himself for his "position of exceptional freedom" (p. 224) by asserting, "There is but One Divine Person who, as the hearer and accepter of prayer, is the *proper Object of worship.*" The Jesuit Perrone does the same. Moreover, when charged with idolatrous tendencies by Protestants, he indignantly exclaims, "Ecquis enim Catholicorum ignorat unum Deum esse adorandum? Stupidos profecto se produnt aut malæ fidei, dum hæc adversarii Catholicis ingerunt, perinde ac si ipsi alios præter Deum adorarent, dum sanctos honore prosequuntur. Imo ex statuto principio et illud infertur, nunquam Catholicos superstitionis in cultu quem sanctis tribuunt argui posse. Si enim cultus pendet ab intentione colentis, et hæc a fide quam colens profitetur, nisi Catholicus contra fidem quam profitetur agere velit, impossibile ipsi est, ut idolatria se commaculet, cum juxta professionem suam unus Deus sit latria colendus, creaturas autem, quæcumque sint, nonnisi cultu inferioris ordinis atque ut servos Dei colere decet, nempe cultu duliæ adorandæ sint." "Is any Catholic ignorant that one God is to be adored? Truly our opponents convict themselves of stupidity or bad faith while they bring these charges against Catholics, just as if they (the Catholics) adored others beside God, while they honour the saints. Nay, it is manifest from their settled principle that Catholics never can be convicted of superstition in the worship they give to the saints. For if worship depends on the intention of the worshiper, and if the intention depends on the faith he professes, it is impossible for a Catholic to defile himself with idolatry, since according to his profession one God is to be worshiped with latria, but creatures, whatever they may be, are to be honoured only with worship of an inferior order, and as God's servants, that is to say, they are to be adored with the worship of dulia" (p. 1155). Unitarians doubtless are defended from idolatry by their first principle quite as well as Catholics—and not a bit better. If they are wise, they will guard against every practice, whether of "exceptional freedom" or not, which may have the slightest tendency to make them, like the Catholics, practically blind to the central truth of the Bible, the one God who alone is to be worshiped. And as it is not safe, so to most Unitarians it cannot I am sure be pleasant, for the mind, while engaged in worship, to be distracted by questions resembling the nice distinctions of Romanism, namely, whether this line or stanza is latria or dulia, and, if dulia, whether it is simple dulia or hyper-dulia. I regard it as painful in fact and of dark omen that ever Unitarian worship should be troubled with such points, and that sincere natures should in this hymn or in that verse have to ask, Does this go over the boundary-line? Yet questions of the kind will arise in the minds of thoughtful Unitarians while they use some of Mr. Martineau's

hymns—"Is this prayer, or is it lyrical apostrophe?" "Is this addressed to God or to Christ?" "It may be 'an exceptional freedom,' but what if it is idolatry?" "How can I determine?" "Where is the dividing line?" "The book needs a comment." Let us take as an example hymn 469:

Joyful self-dedication.

1 Lo! I come with joy to do
The Master's blessed will!
Him in outward works pursue
And serve his pleasure still.
Faithful to my Lord's commands,
I still would choose the better part;
Serve with careful Martha's hands,
And loving Mary's heart.

2 Careful without care I am,
Nor feel my happy toil;
Peaceful in Messiah's name,
Supported by his smile;
Joyful thus my faith to show,
I find his service my reward;
Every work I do below,
I'll do it to the Lord.

3 Thou, O Lord, in tender love,
Dost all my burthens bear.
Lift my heart to things above,
And fix it ever there!
Calm on tumult's wheel I sit,
Midst busy multitudes alone,
Meekly waiting at thy feet
Till all thy will be done.

Who is here addressed? "The Master" denotes Christ. The idea is confirmed by the ascription to him of "*outward* works," especially as the prayer is for power to "pursue" him in them. The whole of the latter part of the first stanza tends to determine this as the right interpretation. Similar is the tendency of the second stanza. Nor does anything occur to raise a doubt until the worshiper comes to the last two lines:

Meekly waiting at thy feet
Till all thy will be done.

Here he is reminded of the Lord's Prayer, in which worship is addressed to God alone; but then "waiting at thy feet" seems to point to Christ. "What is the truth?" he asks. "If Christ is meant, is this a 'lyrical apostrophe' and not a prayer? Certainly the being addressed is conceived of as present; if so, it is a prayer." "Yes, present, but only transiently." "The poem intimates the reverse. It is a permanent presence that is implied throughout. Perhaps in one part God is meant; in another, Christ. The writer (Charles Wesley) was a Trinitarian. The

language, then, is compatible with Trinitarianism—is it compatible with Unitarianism? With the writer, the mingling in one utterance of divine and human attributes was natural and proper, for with him Christ was the God-man. For myself, I make a distinction between the two, and accordingly think that prudence and comfort of mind, if not duty, require me to avoid the use of language which I find so perplexing."

Such "questions of limits where the right consists in balance and proportion" (p. 218), but where sound morality and Christian duty enjoin avoidance, requiring the worship which is in truth as well as in spirit, Mr. Martineau brushes away with a light hand; they are heavy clouds that make bursts of light impossible, and more to be feared than any brilliant fervours (p. 217); not aware, probably, that the Catholic Perrone had appealed to similar heats in justification of the "cultus sacratissimi cordis Jesu"—"the worship of the most sacred heart of Jesus"—in these words: "Quia per hoc sanctissimi cordis symbolum vehementer fideles incalescunt tum ad recolendam Christi morientis passionem, tum ad rependendum eidem Christo amorem et grati animi sensum pro tot beneficiis quibus ab eo affecti et cumulati sunt" (p. 1112). "Because by this symbol of the most holy heart, believers enjoy 'brilliant fervours,' so as to both piously go over the sufferings of the dying Christ and to repay to him love and gratitude in return for the many blessings they have received." But "the argument against a natural usage from its abuse is of all pleas the weakest and most worthless" (p. 218). But with Unitarians is the usage "natural"?—the usage of worshiping any other being but God? the usage of worshiping Christ? the usage of confounding God and Christ in the same act of prayer? the usage of worshiping as if there were two objects of address? the usage of applying to Christ, as understood by Unitarians, language intended by its Trinitarian authors to denote supreme adoration? And if such a usage is natural, is it scriptural? Moreover, is it an act of Christian simplicity to compel a man who is a Trinitarian to be, as it were, present (for the names are given) and take part in Unitarian worship? Finally, is it self-respectful to shew that the boundary-line which justifies your dissent is so slender and evanescent, that in the most solemn acts of life you can employ, with either little or no modification, language designed and fitted to express Trinitarian sentiments and affections? If you thus worship together in word and thought, why do you not worship together in place or at least in communion? Impossible is it to discover a more effectual way to efface the distinctions which separate Unitarian worship from Trinitarian, and so to bring Unitarianism to an end at no distant day by making it a practical solecism.

I must, however, take leave to deny that the question at issue "is a question of limits where the right consists in balance and

proportion." A strange language to come from one connected with a body of Christians whose characteristic is the acknowledgment of the authority of Christ both in questions pertaining to duty and in questions specially pertaining to worship! In one sense (but not the sense of Mr. Martineau), the question of worship is a question of limits; for worship is limited by Christ as well as by the Bible in general to the one Maker of heaven and earth. No place is there here for either balance or proportion. Laxity, vacillation and indifference, find no sanction in the Scripture, in which there prevails even a stern disallowance of all worship except the worship of the one only God. The exclusiveness is justifiable. It is justifiable by fact; every deviation, yea even the slightest, has ended in either idolatry or pantheism. It is justifiable in argument; for there is, there can be, only one Supreme Good; and to worship anything below the Supreme Good is to lower your ideal and debase your nature. If the worship of an inferior being is an "utterance of the highest strength" (p. 218), and should not rather be called a fearful daring, it is certain to issue in pitiable weakness. I have compared a great Catholic teacher with one equally great, exercising important functions in the Unitarian church. In yet another point the two authorities agree. The invocation of Christ is from the first, declares Mr. Martineau. From the first, says Perrone, is the worship of the saints. The two statements are equally correct. I give the words employed first by Perrone and then by Martineau. "Sanctorum cultum ab ipsis rei Christianæ primordiis in ecclesia obtinuisse non unus vel alter testis adest sed facta ineluctabilia ac certissima documenta" (p. 1168). "Not one witness or two, but most certain and unanswerable facts, prove that saint-worship has prevailed in the church from its earliest days." "As the worship of Him (the Father) has always co-existed with the invocation of Christ, no proof of the one avails in the least to disprove the other" (p. 219). Here we have these statements: The Father was always worshiped; Christ was always invoked. To prove the former does not disprove the latter. What is meant by "disprove"? If "disprove" is used of the fact of the invocation of Christ, and if the fact as stated is a fact, the conclusion is valid; but then it need not have been drawn; for a fact is a fact, and the alleged fact, if a fact, is of course a fact. But if "disprove" is used ethically, so as to refer to the right or duty of invoking Christ, the question is altered, and the possibility of a *non sequitur* presents itself. Something of the kind is established by Mr. Martineau himself; for while he thus argues for invocation, he pleads only for apostrophe, and shrinks from benefiting by his own conclusion: "The scriptural case, with that of the earliest church, is indeed *too strong* for the needs of my argument. It is probable that the addresses to Christ which, in the first disciples, were

intensified by the belief of his continued agency and impending return, approached more nearly to the character of personal communion and even prayer, than would be congenial with the faith and feeling of any modern Unitarian, or of the very same persons were they living with us now. In discussing, therefore, the primitive practice, I do not appeal to it as an absolute rule, or claim the whole range which it would allow. So far as it was influenced by conceptions which time has corrected, it must be reduced ere it can serve as a model for us" (p. 221, note). So, then, the universal invocation alleged is a variable quantity. Intensified at the first, it is to be reduced now. What, then, is the exact spiritual *ens* or reality which "always co-existed with the worship of the Father"? When this is defined, its historical existence may be investigated. But, even if ascertained, it could be of little use; for it might not be "congenial with the faith and feeling of any modern Unitarian." If modern Unitarians in general were thus flexible in mind and thus independent of scripture, I should not have troubled myself to examine Mr. Martineau's scriptural argument. Where is the good of asking what the Bible sanctions, if what it sanctions is to be reduced or disallowed as uncongenial with faith and feeling? If you will not allow the alternative of bringing your faith and feeling into agreement with its spirit, it would be more open and worthy to disavow its authority. Surely the Bible is at least a co-ordinate power with individual faith and feeling. And surely a universal practice, such as the invocation of Christ is said to be, deserves more respect than so summary a dismissal.

But the worship of the Father does not disprove the invocation of the Son. The value of the argument depends on the authority you admit. Disown scripture and you may defy confutation. But what if the authority of Christ is admitted, and what if Christ expressly forbids petitions to be made to himself after he has passed into the invisible world, at the same time that he describes the true worshipers as those who worship the Father, adding that the Father seeketh such to worship Him. Then the worship of the Father excludes the invocation of the Son, at least so far as invocation includes petition, and it may be presumed that the primitive Christians did not call upon Christ for nothing. Certainly if they did ask Christ for anything, they acted in direct opposition to his prohibition. That prohibition is conveyed in the following words: "And in that day ye shall ask nothing of me. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give you. Hitherto ye have asked (the Father) nothing in my name; ask (in my name) and ye will receive, so that your joy may be complete" (John xvi. 23, 24). The day meant is the period beginning with the departure of Jesus from the earth, on which the Spirit would be bestowed. Acting under the influence of God's Spirit, the

disciples were to ask nothing of Christ, but all things of God. The consequence would be complete joy, arising from obedience under God's own guidance (compare John xiv. 20, xvi. 5, 7, 9, 13, 16). As if to make the lesson more emphatic, the Great Teacher immediately after adds, "In that day ye shall ask in my name;" and as if also to preclude the supposition that his own mediation was needful, he subjoins, "And I say not unto you that I will beseech the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came from God" (26, 27). A more explicit direction was never given; and the import of the direction is, first, positively, to ask all things of the Father, and second, negatively, to ask nothing of the Son. The positive instruction might have seemed sufficient. Nevertheless it is supplemented by a prohibition. The positive and the negative command combine to shut out requests to Christ, and to direct all requests to God his Father. And then the verb employed (ask, ἐρωτᾶν) is of the widest bearing, comprehending entreaties and requests—in a word, all asking, whether in prayer or any other manner. While, however, ἐρωτᾶν is used in regard to the prohibition of petitions to Christ, αἰτεῖν is employed of the entreaties to be made to the Father, and this verb, according to Lücke,* always denotes das gebet zu Gott, prayer to *God*. Prayer to God is, then, intended when in John xiv. 13, 14, Jesus says, "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it." Here, again, what emphasis to shew that prayer is to be directed to God and in the name of Christ! The emphasis was not superfluous. Witness the practice of prayer to Christ that is still followed, though with ever-lessening prevalence. Witness also the fact that some manuscripts insert μέ, *me*, after "ask," in verses 13 and 14; on which Lücke remarks, "The reading is obviously spurious and belongs to a later time, when prayer to Christ was becoming usual." It is indeed a proof that the practice of prayer to Christ was not universal at a comparatively late period, and that the force of Christ's prohibition was felt as well as the need of scriptural authority. Little creditable was the means employed to obtain the required support, and as little did the falsification manifest respect for Christ, especially as in the very connection he had said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John xiv. 15). How, then, can it be compatible with true reverence for Jesus to put petitions up to him now? Do you take refuge in apostrophe? Is, then, the following an apostrophe?

> Thy parting blessing, Lord, we pray;
> Make but one fold below, above;
> And when we go the last lone way,
> O give the welcome of thy love.

* Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 605.

Here even the diction of prayer ("we *pray*") is employed in an address to the "Lord of sorrow." Whether of Trinitarian or Unitarian origin, the hymn (described by the compiler as "anonymous") plainly contravenes the express prohibition of Christ on which we have now spoken. It may, however, be fancied that prayer to God in the name of Christ is compatible with prayer to Christ as our intercessor with God. This was the comment put on the words of Jesus in corrupt ages. It may therefore be advisable to translate in full the remarks of Lücke on the passage, John xiv. 13, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, in order that the Father may be glorified in the Son:"—"In my glorified state with the Father I will do or secure to you what you shall ask of God in my name (comp. xv. 16 and Matt. xxviii. 20), that the Father may be glorified through the Son. The words 'in order that' (ἵνα), after 'that will I do' (τοῦτο ποιήσω), declare that the object of all that Christ does is in heaven, as on earth (xiii. 31, xvii. 2), the glorification of the Father in the Son. By means of the words, 'in my name,' Jesus makes the granting of petitions dependent on the condition that they are made in his name (xiv. 14, xv. 16, xvi. 23). In xv. 7, he says merely, 'whatever ye ask, it shall be done unto you.' But neither here does the condition fail, namely, the condition that the disciples remain in his fellowship and doctrine. Is now this that which Jesus here and in other places calls asking in his name? Certainly it is in essence the same. Prayer in the name of Christ implies the fellowship of him who prays with the Saviour and his word, while that fellowship allows no other prayer than prayer in the name of Jesus. The name wherein men ought to pray is the name of Christ, the Son of God. To do a thing (to pray, &c.) in that name is to do it on the ground or in the power thereof, in the consciousness of believing and loving fellowship with Christ; in consequence, to do it in his spirit and according to his intention, and with a view to (the advancement of) his kingdom. The abbreviated form 'in Christ,' 'in the Lord,' used by Paul and others, signifies the same. The passage, 1 John v. 14, 'If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us,' has a similar import, recalling that fundamental model prayer, 'Thy will be done.' The reason is, that 'in the name of Christ' is the revelation of the Divine will, as the absolute rule of all thought and action. 'That will I do,' says Jesus, and in verse 14 emphatically, 'I will do it.' Prayer is directed to God (αἰτεῖν by itself always denotes prayer to God), but Jesus fulfils the request. How? Codex B, with several other MSS., reads verse 14 thus: 'If ye ask *me* a thing in my name.' Ought, then, prayer to be directed to him (Christ) and in his name? But the passage in xv. 16, says, 'that whatsoever ye ask the *Father* in my name, he may give it you;' and so in xvi. 23, the Father is he to whom prayer is addressed as well as he who answers prayer. How is

this to be understood? The reading, ἐάν τι αἰτησήτέ με, in verse 14, is clearly spurious, and belongs to a later time, when prayer to Christ was becoming usual. All reference of prayer to Christ lies, according to John, in the words, 'in my name;' and the passages, xv. 16, xvi. 23, clearly decide that as Christ himself directs his prayer to the Father (xvii. 1), so also ought the prayer of disciples to be directed to the Father. But since all that the Father does in his kingdom is communicated to men through Christ, also prayer through his intercession with the Father, so may Christ, specially referring in his thought to his mediatorial office, conceiving himself as in unity with the Father, declare, 'I will do it;' while in other places, when this thought lies in the back ground, he refers everything immediately to the Father." This instructive passage conveys a lesson which all ought to heed who are in danger of offering prayer to Christ, namely, that the prayer which God grants is prayer which so supposes the offerer to be in communion with Christ, that he hears and obeys the word of Christ, as well as follows his example. Genuine Christian prayer, then, is prayer, not to Christ, but after the manner and in the spirit of Christ. I may add, that a higher authority than that of Lücke is not supplied by German scholarship.

The reader is now in a condition to determine whether it is true that the worship of the Father does not exclude the invocation of the Son. If that invocation asks anything of Christ, it is excluded by the worship of the Father. Any way, prayer to the Father in the name of the Son is true Christian prayer, and that prayer is prayer such as Christ offered. But Christ prayed to the Father. To the Father alone, to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God (John xx. 17), did Christ pray. If we would have our prayers heard, we must, on this point at least, be one with Christ.

I have said that the worship of the Father excludes the invocation of the Son, if that invocation asks anything of Christ. But is there ever invocation without entreaty? Why do men make invocation? Surely for something that they wish for or need. In truth, the common use of the word implicates entreaty. In Richardson's Dictionary of the English Language, the sole explanation of the meaning of to invoke (invocate, invocation) is this, "To call to or upon (that is in prayer or supplication), to pray to, to supplicate, to implore." To the same effect, "The Imperial Dictionary" declares invocation to be "the act of adoring God, and especially of addressing him in prayer for his assistance and protection." In Webster's Dictionary, I read, "Invocation, the act of addressing in prayer." A second signification, as exemplified in the phrase "the invocation of the muses," is here shut out by the religious nature of our subject. Invocation, then, is prayer. In consequence, the invocation of Christ is excluded by the worship which Christ himself and the

scripture, which is in harmony with Christ, require to be paid exclusively to the august and venerable Being denominated the Father. I repeat, then, that if the primitive disciples invoked Christ, they violated a solemn and emphatic ordinance of Christ.

Mr. Martineau, however, supplies evidence from scripture and history of his position. The position is that the invocation of Christ has always co-existed with the worship of the Father. In proof, reference is made almost exclusively to a certain form applied to disciples in the early church, and to Pliny's words already cited. Surely the word "always" was never before so ill sustained. On two single pillars rests the arch which spans eighteen centuries! The pillars are obviously slight, what if they are also unsound? It is to the first of these supports I direct attention in what remains of this paper. Before I proceed I must once more call attention to the question which is really in debate. "What we have to determine is, whether along with their strictly monotheistic worship, the early Christians admitted any kind of address to their risen Lord" (p. 219). So says Mr. Martineau. Such a question is not the question I have raised. Nor is it the question which Mr. Martineau's evidences seem to prove. Invocation is not "*any* kind of address," but a certain definite kind of address which the dictionaries define as prayer. And my allegation is that the volume entitled "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home" offers prayer to Christ. This must be admitted unless Mr. Martineau can prove that when men and women in public worship say, "We pray," they do something else than pray. Certainly he does nothing in self-defence so long as he takes shelter under "apostrophe" or "any kind of address to Christ." However, he makes this statement: "Now so well known and characteristic was this practice ('the invocation of Christ') that it even supplied the very phrase by which at times the disciples were defined. Ananias at Damascus, speaking of the Christians whom Paul had come to persecute, says, 'Here he hath authority to bind all that call upon thy name'" (p. 219). Other instances are given, but as those given comprise not all, and so supply only an insufficient means for forming an opinion of the true meaning, I shall include the omitted passages and treat the matter exhaustively. One other preliminary word. I have intimated that this pillar is certainly slender and may be unsound. Mr. Martineau is aware that his proof-texts have been interpreted by no mean authorities in a sense which excludes invocation. Two views, then, are taken of the signification of the passages he alleges. Where such is the case, the utmost that can be pretended is that probability lies on either this side or that. Mr. Martineau's view may be right. It may also be wrong. Any way, there is here no room for positiveness. Yet what more positive than the assertions on the point I have already cited? Take another: "Ineffaceable traces, then, lie on the New Testament itself of

invocation to Christ as the distinctive habit of the apostolic church" (p. 221). Passing by the positiveness of the assertion, I direct attention to the new issue, namely, not, "whether the early Christians admitted any kind of address to their risen Lord" (p. 219), but that "invocation to Christ (was) the distinctive habit of the apostolic church." I accept the issue. It is affirmed by Mr. Martineau; it is denied by me. It is his duty to adduce the evidence, it is mine to subject it to examination. Before I proceed, I desire the reader to observe how the allegation is now curtailed. The "always" has shrunk to the limits of "the apostolic church." What, then, is the evidence? The following: Acts vii. 59, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16; Romans x. 13, 14; 1 Cor. i. 2. This is supplemented by an appeal to the "new song to the Lamb," and the words, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

1. The evidence is insufficient in regard to time. The period which the argument requires to be covered is "the apostolic church." The apostle John survived until near the end of the first century, and with the close of that century the apostolic church is commonly held to have terminated. From A.D. 33 or 34 to A.D. 100, is then the space of time of which the assertion is made. But what space is covered by the evidence? I shall not enter into critical questions as to the exact date to which books or contents of books may refer, but follow the received view as presented by a scholar of good repute, Wieseler.* The earliest point in the evidence is the death of Stephen (Acts vii.), and the death of Stephen is placed in A.D. 39. Then comes the conversion of Paul in A.D. 40. In A.D. 57, Paul writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and in A.D. 58 he writes that to the Romans. The Apocalypse may be fixed at A.D. 60. From A.D. 39, the earliest date, to A.D. 60, the latest, is a period of twenty-two years. Twenty-two years! Such is the actual period covered by the evidence, whereas the allegation covers "the apostolic church." Some six years before the earliest date are blank. A greater and more important blank is found in the thirty or forty years after the latest date. If we take the whole time to be covered with evidence at sixty-seven years (from A.D. 33 to A.D. 100), or say roughly sixty years, then not over one-half of the alleged period does the evidence extend. The evidence, then, is insufficient in point of time.

2. The evidence is insufficient in regard to authorities. There are twenty-seven books in the New Testament. Of these only four are adduced. Yet all the twenty-seven were written after the martyrdom of Stephen. Of these books even the Gospels give names by which the primitive Christians were known, and directly as well as indirectly describe their habits, but not one trace do they afford of this alleged distinctive habit of the apos-

* Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters. Göttingen. 1848.

tolic church. Some twenty of the books are in the shape of letters, and accordingly employ forms of address in speaking to the persons for whom they were intended; yet only two of these Epistles contain any of the alleged evidence. How, then, is it proved that "the invocation of Christ" was "*the distinctive habit* of the apostolic church"? One method of describing disciples of Christ it may have been, but to say that it was *the* method is an exaggeration. The exaggeration is intensified when "distinctive" is added to "the," and still more intensified it is when the strong term "habit" is selected in preference to others. All this exaggeration shrinks into the following facts: 1, that Stephen called on some one; 2, that Paul and Ananias three or four times describe disciples of Christ as those who called on the name of Christ; and, 3, that the author of the Apocalypse exclaimed, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly." Had it been said that the phrase, "to call on the name of the Lord," was occasionally used in the apostolic church as descriptive of Christians (comp. Acts ix. 13, 14), all would have been said that the facts justify. Little need be said as to the authority of the Apocalypse in an historical question, since Mr. Martineau describes it as of limited value. Yet, distrusting the whole, he lingers confidingly near some of the parts. I have no desire to disturb his trusting repose, if only because while in spirit I join in the song of gratitude to the Lamb, I find not one word therein of invocation, but at its termination a form of purely Unitarian worship—"the four-and-twenty elders fell down and worshiped Him that liveth for ever and ever" (Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3). And I too, as any Unitarian, can utter *the wish*, "Amen, come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. xxii. 20).

3. The evidence adduced is not only insufficient, but contradicted. The point to be proved is, that the employment of the form of speech in question was "the distinctive habit of the apostolic church." If so, it must have been universal both in time and space. But the bulk of those writings, where in such a case it must have been found, present no trace thereof. Implicitly, then, the bulk of the New Testament contradicts the allegation. The tacit contradiction extends beyond the pages of the New Testament. There lies before me a Lexicon* which professes to give all the words used by the Greek fathers of the early church. Neither the word nor the phrase in question can I find in the volume. Equally in vain have I looked for both in several ecclesiastical writers of the three first centuries. My industry may have failed to discover what really exists, but I feel myself warranted to declare that the denomination of Christians as those who called on the name of the Lord, so far from existing "always," is not "the distinctive habit" of the ante-Nicene Church.

---

* J. C. Suiceri Thesaurus.

4. The evidence is insufficient, not in quantity alone, but in quality; and that in two ways: 1, generally, and 2, particularly. It is insufficient generally. It is "the distinctive habit of the apostolic church" that is in question. Such a thing, if known to exist, is known by certain clear and numerous facts. Probably there is an historical statement—one or more—to that effect? Nothing of the kind. Probably the church is ever and anon beheld engaged in invoking Christ? Nothing of the kind. At least invocations to Christ appear in the New Testament? Nothing of the kind. Prayers are found there, but they are all addressed to God. Where, then, is the proof of this "distinctive habit of the apostolic church"?

5. The evidence fails in particulars. And, 1, "the calling upon" of the English version is changed by Mr. Martineau into "invocation." Why not cleave to the Saxon original? Is it because the Latinism, "invocation," has a religious import and implies the fact to be proved? "To call upon" and "to invoke" excite very different associations in the mind. Thousands of persons have read of the disciples as calling on the name of the Lord, without once fancying that they invoked or worshiped Christ. To substitute a word declaring the point in debate, is to bid for a cheap victory; but it is to bid in vain. 2. The phrase in the scripture is, to call *on the name* of the Lord. Here, again, a change is made. The terms "name of the Lord" are dropped. Thus the phrase becomes, "to call on the Lord." For "call on," say "invoke," and you thus get "invoke the Lord." 3. But another alteration is requisite. For "the Lord," read "Christ." Now your thesis is nearly complete. You have only to change the verb into its corresponding noun, and you obtain the alleged fact, "invocation to Christ was"—what? "the distinctive habit of the apostolic church"? The extent of the invocation remains to be proved.

6. One of the passages quoted is nothing more than a general application of a prophetic declaration to Christian times, involving a transference of language from the one to the other, in a loose and general manner. I refer to Romans x. 13, 14. This is Mr. Martineau's account of the matter: "The apostle, himself commenting on the text, 'Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved,' applies it to the conversion of the Gentiles: 'How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?'" (pp. 219, 220). To comment is an intentional act. To comment is to explain. Mr. Martineau, then, asserts that Paul here intends to explain the first phrase by the second; whereas his sole purpose is, by linking together scriptural phrases, to illustrate the universality of the gospel (verses 11 and 12). In thus declaring the universality of the gospel, the apostle makes no more than an implied reference to the Gentiles, and in so doing, with his customary play on words, employs

in the 14th verse to possible believers in Christ a phrase borrowed from the Old Testament, and used by the prophet Joel (ii. 32) to describe faithful adherents to the religion of Jehovah. If by "commenting" Mr. Martineau intends, as the word he uses implies, that the second phrase shews the meaning as well as the application of the text, then is Gentile Christian worship not "the invocation of Christ," but the worship of Jehovah. In truth, however, the object of the writer is neither to comment on the prophet Joel nor to define the disciples of Christ, but simply to make to Christian interests a vague and general application of prophetic phraseology. That Paul had no idea that "the invocation of Christ" was either the distinctive habit of the church or the specific title of its members, appears from the connection; for in the 8th and 17th verse he gives what he considers essential in both, in these words: "The word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." In support of the view I have given, I cite the following comments appended by the Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford to the verses under consideration. Verse 12: "As the tenth and eleventh verse, so also the eleventh and twelfth, hang together by a word. The scripture says 'every one,' meaning hereby to include Jew and Greek." Verse 13: "Again the connecting link is a word which is taken up by a quotation from the Old Testament, Joel ii. 32. The same passage is cited by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, as referring to the times of Christ. In the place where it originally occurs, it contains no reference to the Gentiles." Verses 14—21: "The passage which follows is, in style, one of the most obscure portions of the Epistle. The obscurity arises from the argument being founded on passages of the Old Testament. The structure becomes disjointed and unmanageable from the number of the quotations. Some trains of thought are carried on too far for the apostle's purpose, while others are so briefly hinted at as to be hardly intelligible. Yet if, instead of entangling ourselves in the meshes of the successive clauses, we place ourselves at a distance and survey the whole at a glance, there is no difficulty in understanding the general meaning. No one can doubt that the apostle intends to say that the prophets had already foretold the rejection of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles. But the texts by which he seeks to prove or to express this are interspersed partly with difficulties which he himself felt, partly also with general statements about the mode in which the gospel was given." On the passage taken as a whole, Mr. Jowett has these excellent remarks: "Such is the mode in which the apostle clothes his thoughts. The language of the Old Testament is not the proof of the doctrine which he is teaching, but the expression of it. He sees the great fact before him of the acceptance of the

Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews, and *reads the prophecies by the light of that fact.* The page of the Old Testament sparkles before his eyes with intimations of the purposes of God. There is an analogy between the circumstances of Israel, now and formerly, dimly visible. To the mind of the apostle this analogy does not present itself as to the mind of the author to the Hebrews, as embodied in the whole constitution of the Jewish people, but in particular events or separate expressions. Hence, *when passing from the law to the gospel, he is like one declaring dark sayings of old.* And his language appears to us fragmentary and unconnected, because *he takes his citations in unusual senses and places them in a new connection.*" In one of those "separate expressions," in one of those "dark sayings," taken in a somewhat "unusual sense" and placed in an "entirely new connection," and vaguely applied to supposed converts to Christianity, Mr. Martineau finds an express "comment" on Acts xxii. 16, as if it had been the apostle's purpose to acquaint the disciples at Rome with the fact that the distinctive name of the followers of Christ was "those who call on the name of the Lord."

[The remainder of this article, from Dr. Beard, we are compelled, by its length, to postpone to our next No.; but we give the following, since received from him, in reply to Mr. Martineau's paper in the last No.]

The foregoing was written for insertion in the last number of the "Christian Reformer." Its publication was postponed to make way for Mr. Martineau's rejoinder to a part of my reply. The point of that rejoinder consists in a subjective criterion of prayer, two misrepresentations, a *tu quoque* retort, and some personalities. The last, as independent of the matter at issue, I leave to produce their proper effect. The subjective criterion of prayer is founded on the doctrine of "a quasi-presence" of Christ (p. 355), which makes the character of address to Christ "depend on the known [to whom?] intent of the persons using it." This "quasi-presence" is contrasted with a "real presence;" consequently a "quasi-presence" is not a "real presence." Though not a "real presence," it has wonderful powers. Obliterating the intrinsic meaning of language, it makes its proper import depend on a speaker's "known intent." Accordingly, a Unitarian intending to utter Unitarian sentiments may employ a Trinitarian hymn, and a Trinitarian intending to utter Trinitarian sentiments may employ a Unitarian hymn. "The difference lies in the speaker's faith regarding the object addressed,—'in the presumed presence or absence of that higher being.' Does he feel himself within the real range of personal communion?—then the very breathing of a wish is prayer. Does he only fling out the arms of affection [what is that?] on the edge of a separating [from what?] gulf [is this the "formless and empty blank" denied on p. 216?] towards that which lives with him [himself? very like the Hibernian who turned his back on himself] simply in its image and idea [a sort of quasi-life?]—then, be his words what they may, they remain within the limits of apostrophe; they are not, like prayer, the human half of a colloquy, but the whole of a soliloquy,"—as if a soliloquy could be anything but a whole. The meaning, however, is, that the said speaker would have

all the talk to himself. Such is the "poetical invocation" which is demanded as an integral part of the realities and solemnities of public worship! It is a kind of practical dualism, by means of which a man, "be his words what they may," addresses "that which lives with him," while he appears to address that which lives without him. Let us take an example. In the Litany of the Church of England the worshipers use these words: "O God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners." Hearing the words, you would think those who used them Trinitarian. The thought may be wrong. The supplication may proceed from Unitarian lips, being nothing more than "the whole of a soliloquy;" for its "character must depend on the known intent of the persons using it." But here "in the substance of the invocation things are said of Christ which by scripture rule are said of God alone" (p. 352). That is denied by the Trinitarian, who maintains he has sound scripture warrant for what is here said of Christ. And might not a Unitarian say, that while Unitarians in general owned Christ as "the Son" and "Redeemer of the world," he could not deny that the term God was in scripture applied to Christ (John xx. 28, i. 1). Mr. Martineau has another test: "Divine attributes are substantively assigned" (p. 355). The test is open to the reply, "Yes, but in an inferior sense; Christ is here called God because he is God's Son, even as magistrates are in the scripture (John xi. 35) called gods (Ps. lxxxii. 1) because they are God's servants and representatives." This rule of personal intent, then, is of the greatest laxity. Under its latitude, a Christian may address Brahma, provided always he means Jehovah. "The same forms of speech pass in and out at this door of transition, according to the faith of the mind resorting to them." Then let us abandon our Unitarian chapels, for we may honestly worship in the parish church, and employ, as well as our neighbour, Trinitarian forms, provided always we take them in a Unitarian sense; and that can present no great difficulty, for do not Trinitarian authorities declare that they are Unitarian as much as we? And thus the solemn act of prayer, which to be true must be simple and spontaneous, is made to wait on theological debates respecting what is "scripture rule" and what are "divine attributes." Would that our speculators would really be satisfied with scriptural authority in the case, for that has determined that prayer belongs exclusively to God, to the exclusion of all petition to Christ! If so, then petition to Christ is the ascription to Christ of divine functions as well as divine attributes. In consequence, "the invocation of Christ" is idolatry on the part of those who do not believe that Christ is Almighty God, for invocation and petition are in such a case inseparable. Why do men say, "O God, the Son, Redeemer of the world," unless as a ground for adding, "have mercy upon us, miserable sinners." If, however, a speaker, apostrophizing Christ, feels himself within the real range of personal communion, and then and there breathes even a wish, in that wish he utters a prayer. Now, on page 217, Mr. Martineau declares that these immortal natures, towards whom he claims "an intermediate kind of affection," though absent, are "intensely real to us." An affection towards a being intensely real to me must be a real affection, and a real affection to such a being can be nothing less than communion. If, then, in such communion I breathe a wish, in that wish I utter a prayer. But who can help wishing to be like Christ

when in communion with him? Who, then, can help praying to Christ? And as Christ promised to be present with his disciples, and to make his abode with them, prayer to Christ is equally scriptural, natural and inevitable. If Mr. Martineau dislikes the conclusion, let him renounce the premisses whence it logically ensues. In truth, personal communion with Christ is denied by a theory which postulates that "Christ is away in heaven" (p. 355), "far away from the range of personal intercourse" (p. 353), and forming "intermediate links between" us and God in "the conceptions we have of them, the reverence we feel towards them" (p. 353); so that, after all, the divine hierarchy conducts us to God only on the wings of our own sentiments. Alas! how evanescent has proved "that spiritual world which holds all the great and good minds of the past—which makes the prophets, the martyrs, the Christ himself, our own contemporaries," and which stands "right in front of our faith, and absent only from sight"! (p. 216). This subjective theory of prayer was intended by its author "to declare the law before we begin the trial" (p. 350). Any issue gained under the influence of such law may be safely left to the judgment of the impartial reader.

The first misrepresentation is found when (p. 351) I am said to have made "entreaty" the criterion whereby "we know a prayer from an apostrophe." What I really said is contained in these words: "In the entreaty *here put up to Christ* the evil has begun" (p. 27). That entreaty is a prayer—"O Lord, Jesus Christ, have mercy upon us, receive our prayer." Suppressing the words "put up to Christ," Mr. Martineau discourses from page 351 to 356, and of course easily puts me in the wrong.

The other misrepresentation consists in giving (p. 356) as my reply, in a special case, that which I give generally, and in the omission of the special reply. The special reply occurs on page 295. Referring to the 328th hymn, it says, "If you compare this with the piece as it appears in my essay, you will find the third verse to be omitted. Do I then give the four verses as the whole? No, my words are, 'the following stanzas *from* the 328th hymn' (p. 135). I give the four as a part, and at the same time I tell the reader where he may find what I have omitted." In face of these facts, Mr. Martineau is indignant at my "detaching verses from the text, or *(without mark of omission)* erasing them for the production of a new context" (p. 295). This reply Mr. Martineau ignores, and gives instead what ensues: "We indicate the following hymns as containing elements which, with our Unitarian faith, it would be idolatrous in us to use, namely, Nos. 202, &c. *We transcribe some of the verses.* Surely here is an exact specification of the evidence. In employing those words which I have underlined, I gave a mark of omission, if ever a mark of omission was given" (p. 292). Having made this substitution, and so having made me say what he preferred, he writes on, heaping imputation on imputation, equally groundless with the one they are meant to cover or sustain.

The *tu quoque* retort is made by alleging that in my "Unitarian Hymnbook" there are poems as open to the charge of leading to the worship of Christ as the impeached compositions of Mr. Martineau's collection. I meet the averment with a direct negative. On a suitable occasion I hope to make the comparison, and to shew that the language does not go beyond the utterance of a wish. Apostrophe does indeed occur in

my compilation. On this fact Mr. Martineau grounds his attempted retort. In so doing he shews the futility of his charge against me of being adverse to apostrophe; he also exposes the misrepresentation he made to the public when he declared the "new cry" to be, "Beware of apostrophe! eschew the vocative!" (p. 224).

JOHN R. BEARD.

MR. SOLLY ON THE ATONEMENT.*

The evangelical world, so called, was startled some eighteen months ago at the dedication of a volume of sermons, by Mr. Brown, of the Congregational body, to Mr. A. J. Scott, Professor in Owen's College, Manchester, as "the wisest teacher of the truth as it is in Jesus" whom the author had ever known. Considering the quarter from which it came, this was held, at the time, to be a remarkable judgment upon one who is little known publicly as a religious instructor, and of whom, as we have heard his friends affirm, it could not be told what views he distinctly maintained. Mr. Solly, in more imaginative form, endorses this high opinion. He also dedicates his book to Mr. Scott as "to one through whom the wise receive increase of wisdom, and the teachers are taught; by whom lonely seekers after truth are encouraged, and those who labour, however humbly, in an earnest yet catholic spirit for its diffusion, are welcomed and upheld." Yet Mr. Brown professes himself Trinitarian and Orthodox, and is understood to have satisfied even his British Quarterly reviewer upon this matter, while his fellow-disciple is still Anti-trinitarian, and far from sound upon the atonement. What is it in the Manchester Professor that brings these opposite poles together? One sentiment they seem to have in common, an almost unutterable veneration for a theologian of the English Church, whose writings Mr. Scott may have assisted them to understand, but who is not to ordinary readers very definite or clear. Mr. Solly says, "I feel Mr. Maurice to be my greatest spiritual benefactor on earth." Mr. Brown affirms that "he has done more probably than any other single man to make plain the harmony between the oldest truth delivered to us in God's word, and all that is included in the ever-widening circles of the knowledge and activity of mankind." From which we learn that Mr. Brown sees one thing in Mr. Maurice's theology and Mr. Solly another. And it is a curious circumstance that the sermons of the evangelical author are of larger human sympathies than is the essay of his Unitarian fellow-disciple. The essay is redolent

* The Doctrine of Atonement by the Son of God. By Henry Solly. London—Whitfield. 1861.

of the old Puritan style, which Mr. Brown carefully avoids. The sermons remind us of the manner of our own pulpits, while the tone of the essay is altogether orthodox, its manner of thought is orthodox, and its conclusions come almost as near to orthodoxy as it is possible for a professing Unitarian to bring them. Almost as near, we have said, because there are Unitarians who admit the doctrine of substitution, which both Mr. Brown and Mr. Solly deny; and there have been those amongst us who could talk freely of the Divine Trinity as a revelation of the gospel, an abuse of language which Mr. Solly is not likely to make.

The work before us has two subjects, closely connected, yet perfectly distinct from each other. One may agree with the writer upon the atonement, while differing from him as to the peculiar nature of him who came to take away the sins of the world. He maintains the doctrine of Christ's personal pre-existence, who appears to him as a kind of subordinate divinity, the administrative medium of the eternal Deity in creation and in providence, as well as in the redemption of mankind,—himself "begotten, not made," and so distinguished from other men; who are mere creatures, it would seem, formed in the first instance not out of the thought of God, as Christ was, but "out of the dust of the earth," and only afterwards to be regenerated into sonship through Him. Mr. Solly does not say "eternally begotten;" he merely reminds us that time is a mode of human thought, not attributable to the Divine Being. We may therefore infer the "eternal generation" if we will. He only ventures, in a way which he calls "mournfully anthropomorphic," to suppose it at "some period in the depths of a past eternity." This is Mr. Solly's interpretation of the name of Christ as "the only-begotten Son of God," and he receives the doctrine with all its consequences, past, present and future.

Of course, therefore, this doctrine appears in his treatment of the connected question of the reconciliation between man and his Maker. Whatever view is held of the atonement, it must make some difference to think that the reconciliation was made in part by the sacrifice of a Divine Being, and Mr. Solly freely uses the doctrine to enable him to keep as literal as possible his interpretation of certain disputed texts. Otherwise, we do not find his views out of harmony with those generally received amongst us. Our strongest objection would be, that he has overlaid the subject in his endeavour to bring within the boundaries of his own representation of it all that various writers have said, or that the diverse figures of the Scriptures could suggest. All that the author means would have been better said in half the space, and without the incessant repetitions to which he is tempted by his desire to be at the same time comprehensive and clear. He has, for example, eleven sections with sub-divisions in the chapter on "the reason of the sufferings of Christ," while the

same topic re-appears in many other places. This is one of the best portions of the work; but the reasons are loosely given, and among them are set down all the conceivable *results* that could follow or have followed upon the Saviour's death. The chapter leaves, therefore, no unique impression. It is a conglomerate of thoughts, not a work of organic thinking. The author judges otherwise, as will be seen by the closing passage which we are about to cite, and which will convey to the reader a tolerably fair suggestion of the philosophy of the whole book. This is the eleventh section:

"Thus we are brought to that final and general explanation of the sufferings of our Lord to which all the previous reasons adduced have been gradually conducting us, and which seems to sum up, in one inclusive view, the main elements of the solution of the problem.

"1st. The Son of God came to establish the kingdom of God, and to overthrow all that resists and opposes it—to establish a dominion over the affections, thoughts, acts, and especially over the wills of men—a kingdom which is the authority and influence of a loving Father. Now, it is clear that if any beings possess free will, they must be in danger, *at some period of their existence*, of resisting the will of God in some way or other. But it is equally plain that this danger cannot be overcome; or, if the temptation be yielded to, the sin cannot be destroyed by force. Hence the invariable refusal of our Saviour, first during the temptations in the wilderness, afterwards at various times during his ministry, to take to himself an earthly crown, and establish his kingdom by the sword. But as, on the one hand, if any being has to confront and conquer moral evil without the use of force, he must suffer more or less from its virulence; so, on the other hand, if he *is* willing to suffer for the sake of those whom he would govern and bless, he wins their affections, and leads captive their wills. The sin that was in the world was the efficient cause, the primary reason, therefore, of the Saviour's sufferings; his desire to win men to holiness and God was the final cause or reason. For, by thus giving himself unto death the Saviour has conquered sin in the heart of man, and by yielding for the time to wrong, gained a lasting dominion for the right and true—has established, in short, the kingdom of God. By being 'lifted up,' he 'draws all men unto him,' and so atones them with God. The cross of Christ is the throne of Christ, and the crucifixion of the Son of God becomes an atonement for the world, reconciling it unto God.

"2nd. But, inasmuch as 'God is love,' and bestows rewards on all faithful obedience, self-sacrifice and generous love,—rewards so far transcending all proportion to that obedience and sacrifice, Christ suffered that he might receive the reward his Father offered him of 'leading captivity captive, and bringing gifts unto men,' of receiving also gifts and 'all power' for himself which should enable him to redeem them from bondage, and help effectually their efforts to give themselves to him. This was 'the joy set before him.' He accepted the trying charge of 'a few things' that he might become the victorious 'ruler over many things,' and make his subjects more than conquerors through him that loved them, and gave himself for them.

"These then are answers, however imperfect, to the question why

our divine Lord could not have atoned us with God by a peaceful withdrawal from his earthly *status*, and a painless entrance upon his spiritual kingdom with all its glorious duties and heavenly power."

What is all this but to say that Christ died, as he had lived, a martyr, that is, a witness to the truth, the end for which he declared that he had come into the world? Mr. Solly objects to the term, but it is Christ's own, and there is no alternative. If the death of Christ was not in the theological sense penal, a satisfaction to Divine justice, an idea which throws into the shade any natural explanation, nothing remains but to explain it naturally, as Mr. Solly has done, as a death which resulted from faithfulness to duty, to principle, to God. Surely the Unitarians of a past generation did not attribute to Christ a mere martyrdom for opinions. They would agree with Mr. Solly in saying that the value of a martyrdom depends upon the person who suffers it, and upon the cause for which he endures. Perhaps he appreciates more fully than they did the merits of the death of Christ so understood, but the difference is not gracefully expressed by his insinuation that Christ was to them "a mere martyr," as though his own opinion were the contrary of theirs, instead of being, as we have seen, substantially the same. That Christ should die, being a man, was in the order of nature: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Only in Mr. Solly's view of what constitutes a man could such a point lie open for discussion. The human organization is a mere garment to him, which a spiritual being can put off or on at pleasure. He likens it to a vessel containing steam, and speaks of Christ in his condition of infancy as a spirit "reduced in dimensions." There are but few likely to follow our author in sympathy with this kind of speculation. Certainly not the orthodox party, whose grand reason for Christ's death would have made it under the most peaceful circumstances a period of infinite agony. No special pleadings are required of them, no arguing up to a foregone conclusion, no laboured expositions of the figurative language of the New Testament upon this subject, to shew that Christ must have died. They assume the satisfaction to an eternal mystic justice; and the whole mystery is solved, or at least absorbed, in a greater mystery which their faith refuses to touch. But if this is the point to be proved, we scarcely feel that the present work has proved it. In the mean time, we are content to assume—leaving to others to prove the contrary—that Jesus, having borne the infirmities of life, would of course pass like other men through the portals of the tomb. It is at a point beyond this that the real question arises, when we look to the manner of the death of the Son of Man. Mr. Solly argues the two questions together as though they were one. In the manner of that death, as the preceding extract explains it, it was a martyrdom, for it was a violent death incurred by faithful-

ness to a righteous conviction; and Mr. Solly might have admitted as much, and would have been well occupied then in shewing of what immense values such a martyrdom could be. As it is, he writes learned theology about it, but adds little to the natural and simple impression which we obtain from the scripture narrative.

But the secondary "Divinity" of the author vitiates his whole treatment of the professed subject of this work. Christ was a man, he says; but, like the orthodox writers and preachers, he will not allow to Christ anything really human. Whatever he did, whatever he suffered, was all extra-human. The orthodox make Christ to have been a man by aid of the figment of two natures. They do sometimes try to represent him so, in consideration of what they profess to believe, though the process speedily stops. But an Arian can never allow himself in this temporary weakness. Mr. Solly does not. Christ was, he affirms, independent of the flesh; though, with the exception of certain matters of fleshly action, as locomotion, speech by the tongue, touch, suffering of pain, it is difficult to see what human attributes he will really allow Christ to have had. To the orthodox, it is not impossible to conceive the humanity; but in the scheme of our author, Christ is degraded if you make him in any sense like any one else. But what argument will convince an author who can seriously believe that a man could have been an uncreated being, existing in essential manhood before he was born, to whom organic development was a mere fiction, and with whom it was as impossible to fall into sin or error as it is for the eternal God? Mr. Solly may depend upon it that he has not answered the unanswerable humanitarian argument of Mr. Hamilton Thom, to which he in a very superficial way alludes. He makes Christ to have been of a different nature from ours, and therefore not properly our example. Or if not, then all that he says of Christ is so true of all men, that they become as divine as he is supposed in the argument to have been. It is certainly by no means clear which view of this matter the author takes; but he can hardly have yielded to the too common worship of humanity of certain modern writers, and Pantheism he very justly abhors. We therefore credit him with the lesser evil, of having separated Christ from his brethren. He has built up a curious theology, but the true gospel of our sonship to the Father to which Christ testifies, he has set aside, making of the filial relation to God something no longer moral and spiritual, but a mystic metaphysical consubstantiality, an intercommunication of essences and natures. God gives his essence to the Son, and the Son gives his to mankind, and all would be divine together but for the vile body in which we are confined,—a necessary imprisonment, however, for our ulterior development in free-will and virtue. Mr. Solly almost admits the personal Satan of his "foremost theolo-

gian of the English Church." One is tempted to ask, Whose Son is *he*, if natures can be so freely given away? yet how can the author hesitate to believe in a being whom many texts so literally refer to? Mr. Maurice has in truth bewildered our excellent friend, and Christ's own glorious conception of Sonship to the Divine Father, a pure spiritual conception, is lost in patristic subtilties.

With regard to his interpretations of the scripture, Mr. Solly is painfully at fault: he deals with it as though criticism had accomplished nothing in the overthrow of the idle dogma of plenary inspiration, and as if no differences could be observed in the values of scripture words, from whatever part they proceed. Some of the poorest fallacies of orthodoxy are here reproduced. The work is filled with orthodox assumptions and insinuations. The author has even the bad taste to charge the sacred writers with roguery, if they did not mean to say on various occasions what he understands them to have said. We are not disposed to follow him upon this ground. The reader must judge for himself from a few examples. The favourite text of our author is one about which we should have thought there could never have arisen a rational dispute. "I and my Father are one." He argues, again, from the "I am" before Abraham, the very phrase which was used by the blind man, and which, when it suited them, our translators interpreted as "I am he." He does not see that the context gives quite reason enough for the saying, "My Father is greater than I," in Christ having declared his people safe in his hands, and then adding the further guarantee that this was in effect safety in the hands of the Father. There is a hint of a mystic meaning once more in the "Let us make man" of the book of Genesis, and with reference to the creation of all things (do they mean the universe of matter or only this small world?), Mr. Solly does not see that the whole current of speculation upon this matter was probably originated by the bold but natural figure of the text, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." This would be then by the Holy Spirit also, in which, as a distinct person, our author does not believe, though we cannot tell why. The orthodox texts are very strong, interpreted as he has acquired the habit of interpreting; that is to say, the texts upon this point which he does *not* refer to.

Mr. Solly could not have written upon the subject of this work without advancing much that deserves attention. He always writes in a spirit of earnest and devout zeal. We could select many passages of excellent thought and purpose with which we heartily sympathize; but the writer needs no commendation of ours, while we have thought it needful to state what we account fundamental errors in his work. There is one we have yet to name, a fault of method which he commits in common with so

many among modern writers, that it demands distinct notice. Mr. Solly conceives himself to have constructed *a scientific theology:* the very term is a misnomer, and the idea a misapplication of true Baconian principles. To him the Scriptures are what he would call a mine of research, and the truth which they contain is hidden there, like scientific truth among the apparently confused phenomena of nature. It is to be found by hypothesis, verified by observation and experiment. Now we venture to say that the entire conception is a false one; the reader will see the proof of this in the work before us. What Mr. Solly reasons from is phrases, not facts,—philosophic definitions, not truths of experiment. The result is a mass of scholastic disputations, and not in any sense a fruitful work of science. He is ringing changes upon words taken indiscriminately from Holy Scripture, or from Mr. Maurice's writings, or from his venerated creeds. There is no greater illusion than that by which the inquirer is misled who thus misconceives the methods of his research—who does not see that distinct regions of thought require different tests and instruments of investigation. False taste in art originates from a similar confusion of rules, which does not discriminate the materials upon which it works. The strength of a muscle is not commensurable with the strength of a chemical compound, as mechanical and dynamic powers have nothing in them to form the basis of a common argument. So no laws or experiences of science can determine a metaphysical problem, nor any rules of induction resolve a question of morals. These simple differences are often, in our time, overlooked, especially by men who read in all directions with the special view of discovering everywhere illustrations of their own particular professional study. They think themselves reasoning in science when they are only mis-importing scientific facts or phrases. They are misled easily by analogies, and often imagine themselves to be pursuing an unopened vein of truth, because all words are more or less figurative, and their language plays with great freedom upon all the possible senses of a term. It is but too easy to keep out of view dissimilarities which would destroy the analogy: it would be too much to expect that one who with great labour builds a hypothesis upon comparisons, and of phrases and disjointed thoughts, should take the further pains to demolish his own work by looking too closely into it. There is, unhappily, little to be gained by this kind of mistaken ingenuity. We are living just now in an atmosphere filled with inflated sophisms generated from this fallacy of method. It is as though a man should affect to see without regard to the laws of sight. He sees differently from others, but in such a way as to make him fancy that he sees in higher vision than they. The only result is a foolish one, though he cannot be convinced of its folly. He sees what he is tempted to look for, and in the way which most gratifies his own sense of skill in finding it. But

if a scientific theology were a possibility, Mr. Solly is the last man in the world to construct it. He is too entirely literalist in his interpretations. The scripture to him is not a living organism, but a dead mass of propositions. He is not content with the true spiritual sense, if it be not embodied in imaginative metaphysical forms. We prefer the methods of the great Oxford Professor, which are more thorough and true, as they are in results more profound and fruitful,—working in harmony with science, which is all that should be desired, and more genuinely spiritual than all the mystic word-play of the lecturer of Lincoln's Inn.

---

*

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DR. SOMERVILLE.*

This autobiography contains many things which will repay the reader's attention. The author's recollections extended back to the reign of the second George, and covered a period of eighty years and upwards; and his position as a clergyman, and a successful author in historical literature, gave him the opportunity of intercourse with persons concerning whom we are glad to receive his impressions. It is true that neither in the incidents of Dr. Somerville's life, nor in the features of his individual character, is there any marked specialty. But even commonplace men may observe correctly and report candidly, and thereby entitle themselves to an audience from the public.

Thomas Somerville, the author of this autobiography, was born at Hawick, Feb. 26 (O. S.), 1741. His father was a Scottish clergyman, respectably connected, and his mother was the daughter of one of the same respectable rank. He was the fifth child, but the only son of his parents. The details he gives of his education, first in schools at Hawick and Dunse, and afterwards in the University of Edinburgh, tend to shew that the work of education a century ago was but partially understood even in Scotland, and that the modes adopted were such as would find little countenance at the present time. In the schools, ill-chosen books, with the Latin in one column and the English in another, left little for the ingenuity of the pupil to do; and in both school and university the instructors paid inadequate attention to antiquities, geography, prosody, and those illustrations of classical authors which give their chief use in education to the Greek and Latin classics. In the Logic class in the University of Edinburgh, Somerville found the Professor using the text-book in

---

* My own Life and Times, 1741—1814. By Thomas Somerville, D.D., Minister of Jedburgh, and one of His Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary. Post 8vo. Pp. 398. Edinburgh—Edmonston and Douglas.

Latin of the Prussian Professor, Heineccius,—a practice more tending to the improvement of the class, ill-grounded in classical knowledge, in Latin, than in logic and moral philosophy. In other classes, too, he found the Professors adhering, and with more or less of servility, to antiquated text-books. In the Mathematical class he found, as those of a later generation have also found, a Professor destitute of practical skill in communicating to others the knowledge he himself possessed. The Professor who will not deviate from the standard of consummate science, or accommodate himself to the capacity of his scholars, may be appreciated by one or two out of every hundred of his pupils, but to the mass of them he will speak in an unknown tongue, and will be their wonder or their laughing-stock. Afterwards, under the influence of Principal Robertson, the eminent historian, a better system of instruction was adopted by the Professors, and men of eminence began to adorn the several chairs; but it was only towards the close of Somerville's academical career that Dr. Robertson's authority was felt. At the very beginning of Somerville's college life, he had the misfortune to lose his excellent father (his mother died in his eighth year). The elder Somerville appears to have been a genial and accomplished man, moderate in his theological opinions, having little of the Calvinistic leaven in him (his favourite models in sermon composition were Tillotson and Clarke), much given to hospitality, and a warm and generous friend of deserving young men. The family removed to Edinburgh, and, by stringent economy and aid from a relation, it was found practicable to continue the education of the younger Somerville. Before quitting college, he increased his means by undertaking the office of tutor, his pupil being a grandson of Lord Somerville, James Bland Burges, who afterwards achieved a moderate rank both as a politician and an author, and in 1795 obtained a baronetcy.

During the latter part of his residence in the University, Somerville improved himself in knowledge, taste, and in the expression of his ideas, both in writing and speech, by attaching himself to two societies, one of which was theological, the other related to the belles lettres.

Of the more eminent preachers in Edinburgh at this period, he gives a good description:

"During my residence in Edinburgh and its vicinity, the pulpits were filled with a great proportion of able preachers. On the excellence of Dr. Blair's sermons, which have now been long in the hands of the public, I need not enlarge. His manner of delivery was not equal to the matter of his discourses. It was stiff, formal, and not altogether free from affectation. I may here notice that the sermons of Dr. Blair appear to me occasionally liable to censure from overstraining, or giving too high a colouring to the present pleasures and rewards of a religious and virtuous life. He seems, in particular, to maintain that peace and

joy, on the near approach of death, invariably accompany genuine piety, and are essential criterions of the sincerity of a religious profession. This position I consider not only untrue, but of pernicious tendency, and discouraging to good men, whose faith not unfrequently fails them at the awful crisis of death. Fact and experience supersede any discussion of this subject, founded on physical causes. In the course of my attendance on dying persons, I have often witnessed the consolations of Christian faith; but I have seen the pious and the virtuous dejected, disconsolate, appalled, and persons of an opposite character composed, indifferent, intrepid, on the immediate approach of death.

"Dr. Dick, minister of the College Church, a man otherwise of very great ability, possessed every attribute of a good preacher. His sermons were rich in sentiment, often tender and pathetic, and delivered with much dignity and gracefulness, so as at once to interest and delight his hearers, and to leave a solemn and abiding impression on their hearts. But his health was broken, his spirits depressed, and his stock of discourses scanty.

"Mr. Walker, in the High Church, compressed and softened the Calvinistical doctrines, in simple Addisonian language, pronounced with a vivacity, harmony, and sweetness of tone, that charmed every ear; his sermons being chiefly liable to censure on account of a sameness of thought.

"Dr. Wallace, minister of the New North Church, and one of the deans of the Chapel Royal, had more originality of mind than any minister in Edinburgh. He was called by his contemporaries 'the philosopher,' because he was particularly fond of philological and metaphysical studies. He excelled in giving a rational explanation of difficult texts of Scripture, and throwing light on obscure subjects. Dr. Wallace was the author of several philosophical and political tracts, which discovered depth of thought and sound judgment. One of them, if I rightly recollect, treats of population and the numerous inhabitants of Europe under the Roman empire. Some of the sentiments contained in Malthus' admired work are forestalled by Dr. Wallace in the pamphlets to which I refer.

"Dr. Wishart was distinguished, among those ministers who had been educated at the same period, for his accurate composition, and the practical character of his discourses. His meek apostolic countenance, the mildness of his address, the perspicuity and elegance of his expression, and the moral tendency of his teaching, rendered him acceptable as a preacher to persons of cultivated taste. He was especially a favourite with those of his hearers who were partial to the Arminian system.

"In many respects the preaching of Dr. Drysdale was not less masterly than original. He had made the stoical philosophy the special object of his study, and it was his aim to incorporate its austere dogmas with the doctrines and precepts of the gospel. His language was copious, but at the same time nervous; his periods harmonious, and his delivery forcible and emphatic.

"Dr. Robertson, Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and minister of the Old Greyfriars' Church, excelled in lecturing, or explaining and illustrating large passages of Scripture, particularly such as were narrative and historical, and in a suitable application of them to human life and characters. His sermons were always sensible and useful, and the more easily followed on account of the different heads or articles

being arranged with logical precision. He never attempted to address the passions.

"To Dr. Erskine, Dr. Robertson's colleague in the Old Greyfriars', as a practical and useful preacher, I have no hesitation in assigning the preference, not only to his contemporaries, but almost to any preacher I ever heard. Although attached to the orthodox system, the tenor of his sermons was invariably practical. Dr. Erskine's aspect was austere, his pronunciation harsh and monotonous, his composition defective in elegance and correctness; but the solidity of his matter, the weight of his arguments, the perspicuity of his expression, the fervour and earnestness of his address, much more than atoned for these minor imperfections."—Pp. 57—62.

Of the state of ecclesiastical parties which our author found existing in Scotland, his description is striking. He was from the first alive to the narrow prejudices—the offspring of the malignant party struggles of the preceding century—which were common to the Scottish nation generally, and to the clergy especially. The weaning of the nation from the bitter anti-prelatical spirit (a spirit which survived the days of the League and Covenant), he attributes in part to the popularity and influence of Whitfield, whose zeal as an evangelist made him overleap and despise the boundaries and landmarks of many of the sects and parties.

Licensed as a probationer in 1764, it was not till 1767 that Thomas Somerville obtained a clerical appointment. He then entered on the duties of an ordained minister at Minto. This appointment led shortly after to his taking up his residence as an inmate of the family of Sir Gilbert Elliott, the accomplished head of a family which has since attained the honours of nobility. Somerville assisted in the education of Lord Minto and Mr. Hugh Elliott. It was to his lasting advantage to enjoy the society of the literary and other guests who were during the Parliamentary recess the visitors of Sir Gilbert. The literary and social influences of this period of his life doubtless tended to confirm him in the habits of thought and action, so little tinctured with Calvinistic severity, which had probably descended to him from his father. Dramatic literature, the theatre, society in all its various phases, the conversation of persons of talent and eminence, whatever might be their opinions, had to him unspeakable attractions. In 1769, he visited London, and by the kindness of his patron was taken to Court, wearing the ruffles which belonged to David Hume. The Scottish divine, arrayed in a court dress, with a bag-wig and a sword, must have been a wonder to himself! The King's printer, Strahan, first suggested to Somerville the expediency of authorship as a means of increasing the scanty stipend of a Scottish clergyman.

Among the friends whom Somerville made in his first visit to London was Dr. Price, and the cordiality of the intercourse

between the two ministers of religion shewed that Somerville had little of the horror of heresy which most of his successors of the present day would feel. The common friend who introduced them was Dr. Rose, one of the earliest writers in the Monthly Review and author of a translation of Sallust.

"I had an invitation from Dr. Rose to dine with him weekly on Friday, his public day, and derived great entertainment from the conversation of his literary friends who made up the party. Dr. Rose had a rich store of anecdotes relative to contemporary authors; and in moral and religious subjects his communications were interesting and impressive. He was an intelligent and sincere Christian. He informed me that the clerical profession had been his early choice and destination, and with that view he had completed his university studies at Aberdeen, but that conscientious scruples about signing the formula, an indispensable qualification for obtaining a license, had compelled him reluctantly to abandon the prospect of sustaining the pastoral office in his native country, and to resort to England on the chance of finding employment in literature. He spoke with warm affection of Dr. Doddridge, under whom he had been employed as an usher, and with admiration of Dr. Foster, who had a few years before preached weekly at the Old Jewry to crowded audiences, composed not only of dissenters, but members of the church, many of them of high rank, attracted by the liberality of his sentiments, and the splendour of his eloquence. I was informed by some of my literary acquaintances in London, that Dr. Rose and Dr. Kippis were the authors of the theological articles in the Monthly Review, and though I did not find myself at liberty to ascertain the fact on Dr. Rose's authority, yet from the strain of his sentiments on the most important topics discussed in these articles, I entertain no doubt of the correctness of my information. To Dr. Rose I was indebted for an introduction to Dr. Price, with whom I had many pleasant interviews. I preached for him at Newington on the occasion of his dispensing the sacrament. The subject of his discourse was the Wedding Garment, Matthew xxii. 11, which he explained by a reference to Rev. xix. 8. The exhortations founded upon it were in substance the same with those generally introduced in our own church at fencing the tables, previous to the dispensing the sacrament. The bread and wine were handed by Dr. Price himself to all the communicants sitting in the pews usually occupied by them. The simplicity of Dr. Price's manners, and the sincerity stamped upon every sentence he uttered, gave a peculiar charm to his conversation. I was, however, surprised by a departure from his mildness and gentleness when any subject of a political nature was introduced, such as the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes from the House of Commons, which was at that time a constant topic of discussion in every company. When I mentioned the gross immoralities of Mr. Wilkes rendering him unworthy of popular favour, he said he was a man he could trample under his foot, but the question which he had been the occasion of moving was of such constitutional magnitude, that his private character ought to have no influence on the decision of it. The asperity and boldness of Dr. Price's political sermons on the American war and the French Revolution, exhibit a perfect contrast to that modesty and charitable spirit which pervades all his theological works, and particularly his controversial discourses."—Pp. 143—146.

In other passages of this autobiography, the name of Dr. Price occurs. After describing an Edinburgh clergyman of some popular and practical talent, named Webster, he proceeds to say:

"The scheme for the benefit of the widows of the ministers of the Church of Scotland, was first suggested, and chiefly promoted, by the services of Dr. Webster. In framing the plan, and particularly in the detail of calculations, he derived important assistance from the Rev. Dr. Wallace, and Mr. Maclaurin, Professor of Mathematics.

"Mr. Bogue, a dissenting minister, who lately published a *History of the Dissenters*, ascribes this important work to Dr. Price, of Newington. The inaccuracy of this assumption I am enabled to assert from personal knowledge. In a conversation I had with Dr. Price at his own house in April 1769, he introduced the subject of the widows' scheme in Scotland, asking some questions relative to its management and results, which I found myself incompetent to answer. He requested that, after my return to Scotland, I would do him the favour of transmitting to him the annual reports of the trustees of the fund, together with any other papers tending to throw light on that subject—the more interesting to him because he intended soon to publish a work on schemes for providing similar annuities. I was happy in having an opportunity of obliging a person so highly esteemed, and sent him all the annual reports, with several other papers relative to the widows' fund. After the perusal of the documents, Dr. Price, either in the above publication, or in a detached pamphlet, expressed an unfavourable opinion of our fund, and specified what appeared to him, in a theoretical view, errors in calculation. This produced a letter from Dr. Webster in answer to Dr. Price's objections, with which Dr. Price was so entirely satisfied, that he candidly acknowledged that he had been too precipitate in his censure; and he expressed unqualified approbation of the widows' scheme, and of the ability and correctness of its author."—Pp. 104—106.

One important result of his first visit to London was his introduction to the lady, Miss Charters, who in 1770 became his wife.

His need of an improved income was supplied by his translation to Jedburgh, a pleasant place of residence and having a large stipend attached. He had some difficulties at Jedburgh owing to the spirit of party on the *questio vexata* of patronage. His predecessor, Dr. Macknight, had reclaimed to his church some families who had joined the secession.

"A few of them apostatized again on my admission; so that my ordinary hearers were not numerous. I never resorted to any mean artifices to court popularity. I made no change in the tenor of my sentiments, nor the style of my composition and manner of delivery, except submitting to the drudgery of repeating my sermons instead of reading them. In my ordinary course of preaching I stated and explained what I believed, after conscientious study, to be the simple and genuine doctrines of the gospel, and insisted largely and most frequently on practical subjects. I was diligent in the performance of all the other pastoral duties, as expressed in a preceding part of these memoirs. I formed a resolu-

tion, to which I steadily adhered, of making no distinction in social intercourse between the families of the Dissenters and those of my own congregation. Though this rule of conduct was not approved of by many of the latter description, yet the propriety of it has been evinced by my experience; as it has conduced, according to my expectation, to efface gradually those prejudices which might have disturbed my personal tranquillity, and limited and obstructed my public usefulness."—Pp. 173, 174.

In 1779, he paid a visit to England, being accompanied by Mr. Maclagan, the minister of Melrose. They reached York on a Saturday, and attended the playhouse, worshiping a part of the following day at the chapel of St. Saviourgate, where they heard Mr. Cappe preach "an affecting discourse on Divine Goodness." They were accompanied on this occasion by an accidental fellow-traveller of the name of Matthewson, who a few days afterwards was arrested on a charge of forgery and executed in London. For a moment a shade of suspicion fell on Somerville and his friend, but an explanation set them quite right with the police authorities. He by this incident formed the acquaintance of Sir John Fielding, with whose shrewdness he was strongly impressed. Our author, at his request, conversed seriously with Matthewson, and received some not unimportant confessions from him.

It was during this visit to London that Somerville saw something of a wild scheme (which soon came to nothing) of united worship without a theology. Who the more numerous sect of Bereans were to whom he refers we know not. Their name is not recorded in any account of the denominations to which we have access.

"General Melville, with whom I had occasional intercourse, was at this time enthusiastically officious in promoting the success of a deistical chapel lately opened under his patronage and instigation, by Mr. Williams, who had formerly officiated in a dissenting congregation. The professed purpose of this institution was to unite all the worshippers of the one supreme God, without any reference to such articles of faith as were the cause of religious separation and discriminating names. A liturgy, excellently suited to this latitudinarian plan, was composed by his chaplain, Mr. Williams; and the General exercised unwearied solicitude to gain proselytes, and to collect attendants every Sunday at the appointed place of worship in Portland Square. He was particularly anxious to prevail on ministers connected with the dissenting interest to give their countenance to his Catholic design, by preaching occasionally for Mr. Williams on subjects of a moral tendency. Flattering my liberal principles, he requested the favour of my consenting to undertake this duty. I told the General that I did not yield to him in the expansion of my charity, but that it was my firm and conscientious conviction, that no person who had heard of the gospel and believed it to be a revelation from God, could be authorized to approach and worship him but in the name of the Mediator whom he had appointed.

"I consented, however, to accompany the General the next Sunday

to his favourite oratory. The spirit of the prayers was devout and liberal, and all the sentiments contained in them, pure, rational, and practical. A chapter of the Proverbs was read with great solemnity and judicious emphasis, without any comment; for, so far from rejecting the Scriptures in the mass, select passages were acknowledged by this new sect of Illuminati to hold a distinguished rank in the catalogue of moral didactic compositions; and a discourse, without the preface of a text, was afterwards delivered, describing, with glowing eloquence, the tendency and fatal effects of the prevalent vice of gaming. The congregation was not numerous, and, from their apparent indifference, I suspected that they had assembled from motives of curiosity more than of principle or zeal. I did not count above half a dozen ladies; and after the conclusion of the service I noticed this circumstance to the General as ominous. I told him that I did not believe it possible that any religious sect could flourish or even continue to exist, without the countenance of the fair sex, and that I highly applauded their wisdom and gratitude in withholding it from an institution subversive of the Christian religion, to which they were indebted for the elevation of their rank, and the kindness and courtesy they had obtained in every country where it had been introduced.

"My prediction was fulfilled; and the immorality of this moral teacher, Mr. Williams, soon after becoming notorious, superseded the intervention of argument, and accelerated the disgrace and dispersion of his flock.

"Upon the dismission of this little congregation, we were met by such an immense crowd pressing at the entrances to the chapel, that we could not make our escape without a struggle; and when I inquired who came next, I was answered by one of the female sex, which seemed to predominate in this new assemblage, *The Bereans, if you please.* The learned Dr. Horsley a few days before had mentioned this sect (the Bereans) to me, of which I had not before heard. He said it had lately sprung up in the west of Scotland, and he seemed to speak of it as an interesting event, and likely to make a figure in the history of the Christian church. I confess I was rather ashamed to be found ignorant of an event occurring at my own door which appeared to him so important."—Pp. 215—219.

The House of Commons, as well as the theatre, had its attractions for our author.

"One of the most interesting debates to the friends of religious liberty during this Session of Parliament, was occasioned by a petition of the Protestant dissenters, to obtain exemption from subscribing the doctrinal articles of the Church of England. The petition was presented by Mr. Dunning, who, both on account of his talents and his zeal, held the first rank among its supporters. His figure was uncouth, and his voice harsh from a sort of nasal pronunciation, but his expression perspicuous, correct, and nervous, and his arguments so powerful, that any attempt to answer them would have been futile. Lord North, in reply, laboured to turn the attention of the House to such circumstances as were calculated to supersede or preclude the intervention of argument. He affirmed that the petition had originated with a party among the dissenters who were notoriously inimical to the orthodox doctrines maintained by the Established Church; that the concession prayed for would be an inlet

to a torrent of heresy, not less fatal to the Christian religion than to the Episcopalian establishment; and he alluded, jocosely rather than seriously, to the personal danger which he, as a minister, must incur, by consenting to destroy the bulwarks which the wisdom of our fathers had erected for its security. His expression was, 'that he might expect to have his eyes pulled out by the indignant multitude, if he consented to a petition that was to open an inroad on the fundamental articles of Christian faith.' Great stress was likewise laid on a counter-petition from a considerable body of the dissenting clergy, distinguished for their loyalty and zeal for the orthodox faith. The petition of the dissenters for exemption from subscription was rejected at this time; but such was the impression made on the public mind by the arguments adduced in support of it, that, in the course of a few years afterwards, it obtained the approbation of the legislature with little opposition, and without being productive of those portentous evils which had been predicted on the first moving of the question."—Pp. 188—190.

Like many of his order, Dr. Somerville entertained what now would be termed Conservative politics, but was moderate and tolerant. He refused in 1779 and 1780 to join in the anti-Catholic agitation. He regarded, he says, "the penal statutes affecting the Roman Catholics as disgraceful to the British code and to the Protestant religion;" and to this conviction he adhered in the face both of popular and clerical clamour.

When Dr. Somerville resolved to act on Mr. Strahan's advice and undertake literary composition, he selected as his topics the reigns of William III. and Anne, and the result was his publication of some volumes which Professor Smyth commends as "very useful," as "abounding in observations generally very judicious," and as not yet "sufficiently known nor duly estimated."

Dr. Somerville was aided in his literary researches by Dr. Kippis, and to him owed an introduction, then accorded with much more reserve than at present, to the Reading-room of the British Museum.

"During my attendance at the Museum I met with the greatest attention from all the officials there, and was laid under the deepest obligations to Dr. Woide, the Oriental secretary, who had the charge of the Hebrew and Arabic manuscripts. As the students were not permitted to carry any books or papers without the walls of the Museum, he procured me the favour of perusing in his lodgings such as I wished to consider with greater attention, or had not time to overtake during the limited hours of attendance in the reading-room. I came to him at an early hour, and had great pleasure in his conversation at breakfast. He was a native of Poland, and had been a Protestant dissenter. I regretted my ignorance of the Hebrew, in which he was a proficient and might have contributed to my improvement in Biblical criticism,—a subject which he often introduced, and I endeavoured to avoid, from the consciousness of my incapacity to bear a part in it, so far as connected with the Hebrew. Dr. Woide was at that time superintending the printing

of the Alexandrian manuscript of the Greek New Testament."—Pp. 210, 211.

It was Dr. Somerville's privilege to entertain, in 1785, Edmund Burke, who on that occasion foretold, what we now lamentingly see fulfilled, the separation of the Southern States of America from the Union.

"In the course of this summer, 1785, I was honoured with a visit of the celebrated Mr. Burke, attended by his son, Mr. Windham, and Sir Gilbert Elliot, whose guests they then were. Mr. Burke was on his way to Glasgow to be installed in the rectorship of the University, which had been recently conferred on him. Sir Gilbert had the goodness to invite me to accompany his visitors to Minto, and afforded me the opportunity of knowing more of Mr. Burke's sentiments and manners than I could have done from the short interviews I occasionally had with this eminent person, when permitted to wait upon him in London. During the few days I thus spent in his company, all sorts of subjects—politics, criticism, theology—were introduced in the course of our conversation; and I was astonished with the richness and brilliancy of his language, and the universality of his knowledge. Mr. Burke professed himself a firm believer in the divine authority of the gospel; but discovered what I thought an illiberal and exclusive partiality to the Episcopalian government and forms of worship. He spoke with high admiration of Butler's Analogy, as containing the most satisfactory answer to the objections of philosophical sceptics. I was not a little surprised by the disparaging, and even contemptuous terms in which he expressed himself in regard to the Americans, whom he had so often eulogised in Parliament during the continuance of the late war. He said that he would not be surprised at the defection of some of the colonies from the Union—I believe he mentioned the southern states. Their constitution was not then settled, and the democratic party threatened to overpower the interests of the Federalists, to whom he gave full credit for wisdom and patriotism. Of Washington he spoke with enthusiasm, and said that his character would be transmitted to the latest ages, among the first of heroes and patriots."—Pp. 220—223.

Dr. Somerville took an active part, both in the General Assembly and elsewhere, in the attempts made to abolish the Test Act, and in 1791 visited London in order to assist Sir Gilbert Elliot in preparing for a debate on the subject.

"I had frequent interviews with Sir Gilbert Elliot, and, by his desire, furnished him with all the approved publications on religious liberty, toleration, and tests, and the historical facts bearing on these subjects. In the course of my inquiries and researches I was ably assisted by Mr. Johnstone, bookseller, St. Paul's Churchyard, who not only had an ample collection of publications on polemical theology, but, from his own knowledge, and the conversation of his customers, was well qualified to recommend such of them as were most worthy of perusal. His shop was daily frequented by the most respectable dissenting ministers, particularly those of the Socinian or Unitarian class. Here I was introduced to Dr. Priestley, who complimented me on the business that had brought me to London. He was just preparing to set out in the coach for Birming-

ham, so that our opportunity of conversation was short, which I had no reason to regret, because if it had been prolonged we should probably have been set at variance by the introduction of political subjects, which neither of us at that time were qualified to discuss with temper and moderation."—Pp. 231, 232.

The result of Dr. Somerville's labours for the repeal of the Test Act was not auspicious.

"I attended the House of Commons on the day of the debate. Sir Gilbert Elliot began his speech with an account of the origin of the overture, and did great honour to Dr. Charters and myself by bearing testimony to our characters, both in our professional and general conduct, and insisted particularly on the purity of our motives in agitating the business now brought under the consideration of the legislature. He concluded a speech replete with solid argument, by moving that the House should immediately resolve itself into a committee, to consider how far the provisions of the Test Act extended, or ought to extend, to persons born in Scotland. The motion was seconded by Sir William Pulteney. Sixty-two voted for it, and one hundred and twenty against it. The principal speakers in support of our petition were, Sir Gilbert Elliot, Sir Adam Ferguson, Mr. Anstruther, Sir William Pulteney, and Mr. Fox. In opposition to it, Mr. Dundas, the Lord Advocate, and Mr. Pitt.

"There are few actions of my life which have been more misunderstood and misrepresented, and few also that have afforded me more solid pleasure on reflection, than the endeavours I used, however unsuccessfully, to obtain the repeal of the test. I have always considered it as not less injurious to religion than to sound policy. Ever since the dawn of reason, and the earliest attention I was capable of exercising on any subject of a serious nature, I have considered the blending religious tests with civil institutions as an intrusion into consecrated ground, and a gross profanation of sacred things. The Lord's supper was appointed to be a memorial of the death of Christ, and the qualification essential to a worthy participation in it, is faith in Him as the Redeemer. How daring and impious the compelling any person solemnly to profess the remembrance of the death of Christ who may not even be a believer in his divine authority, and may not, perhaps, wish to be so considered! The ground of objection to the Test Act is not confined to any particular sect, or party of Christians. It ought to have the same force with every enlightened Christian, of whatever Church he professes himself a member—whether he be Episcopalian or Presbyterian. The Test Act is a daring usurpation upon the authority of Christ, and, though it were but a dead letter and never enforced, it ought to be repealed, in order to rescue the British code from the awful guilt of sacrilege.

"Although our application for the repeal of the sacrament test was not attended with success, yet I have reason for being persuaded that salutary effects, in a moral view, have resulted from bringing this subject under the view of the legislature. There has not, perhaps, a single instance of the enforcement of the statute occurred since; which may be fairly imputed to a secret and growing conviction of its injustice, the result of the discussion of the question on this and similar occasions. It was truly observed by Mr. Fox in the course of the debate, that the

cause of toleration and religious liberty, though resisted and apparently vanquished, would always be acquiring accumulated strength, as often as it was brought under the attention of the public."—Pp. 240—243.

The remaining incidents in Dr. Somerville's life are soon told. He obtained a Royal Chaplaincy, with a salary of £50 per annum. In 1809, he lost his excellent wife. It is fit to mention that Mrs. Somerville, whose treatises on the Connection of the Physical Sciences and on Physical Geography have given her a wide celebrity, was first a pupil and then daughter-in-law of our author, marrying as her second husband, in 1812, Dr. William Somerville. She was a daughter of Vice-Admiral Sir William Fairfax.

"Miss Fairfax had been born and nursed in my house, her father being at that time abroad on public service. She afterwards often resided in my family, was occasionally my scholar, and was looked upon by me and my wife as if she had been one of our own children. I can truly say, that next to them she was the object of our most tender regard. Her ardent thirst of knowledge, her assiduous application to study, and her eminent proficiency in literature, and in science and the fine arts, have procured her a celebrity rarely attained by any of her sex; but she never displays any pretensions to superiority, while the affability of her temper, and the gentleness of her manners, afford constant resources of gratification to her family and intimate friends."—P. 390.

"Dr. Somerville concludes his own recollections by expressing his gratitude to God that up to the advanced age of seventy-three, which he had then reached, he had been favoured with uninterrupted good health, and that he was still in possession of the capacity of discharging the ordinary duties of his profession, as well as enjoying the many blessings that remained to him. With hardly any qualification, the same language might have been used by him in his ninetieth year, and until within a few days of his death. He never ceased to be able to take delight in the society of his friends; or to find pleasure in his books—to the last, too, keeping himself abreast with the literature of the day;—or to feel a keen interest in public events and questions; or, above all, to retain that active solicitude for the welfare (both temporal and spiritual) of every individual member of his flock, which, in a very remarkable degree, characterized him throughout his long and useful life. Mr. Lockhart, who, at this period, 'spent many pleasant hours under his hospitable roof with Sir Walter Scott,' speaks of him as 'preserving his faculties quite entire to a great old age,' and says, 'We heard him preach an excellent circuit sermon when he was upwards of eighty-two; and at the judge's dinner afterwards, he was among the gayest of the company.' (*Life of Sir W. Scott*, ch. viii.) In the year 1828, a public dinner was given to him by his co-presbyters and some of his other friends, on the occasion of his completing the sixtieth year of his ministry. He was by that time the father of the Church of Scotland, having outlived the whole of those of his brethren who were ministers of the Church at the date of his own ordination. On Sunday the 9th of May 1830—to quote an obituary notice in a contemporary newspaper—'he preached and dispensed the Lord's Supper to his people, with much animation, ability, and feeling, alluding in the close of the service to the probability that it might

be the last occasion of the kind on which they might meet together. . . . He took a solemn leave of them on that Sunday afternoon, and gave them what might be considered his parting admonition and benediction. 'Yet his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.' In the course of the same evening he became seriously indisposed, ... and on the evening of the following Sabbath he departed peacefully, rejoicing in the hopes and consolations of the gospel.'"—Pp. ix—xi.

We have only to add that the reader will find in the concluding portion of this unpretending work a comparative estimate of the early and latter days of the author, and of the manners and customs which he found to prevail and those which took their place. Most cheering were the indications of advancing civilization which he was permitted to witness, and those indications have been most amply confirmed by our experience during the eventful half century which has nearly passed away since good Dr. Somerville, full of years and honours, sank to rest.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Duties and Hopes: a Sermon, preached at the Chapel, Effra Road, Brixton, before the Members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, at their Thirty-sixth Anniversary Meeting, May 22, 1861. By Charles Beard, B.A. Published at the Request of the Committee. Cr. 8vo. Pp. 31. London—E. T. Whitfield.

We do not intend, in our notice of this sermon, to aim at any adequate description of its merits, because we are desirous that all our readers should procure it and form an estimate of it for themselves. In that case, we are convinced a concurrence with our appreciation of its excellence will be secured. It is too clear and powerful not to stamp its true character upon every candid mind. We had the satisfaction of hearing it preached, and were unaffectedly glad that a young man like Mr. Beard should so prove his fitness for manfully sustaining the cause of liberal Christianity, whether in the field of cultivation or of battle. Our renewed acquaintance with it in its present shape has but strengthened the pleasing recollections we have of the past.

It is, we are happy to say, a *sermon*—distinctively such—possessing in manner and in matter the proper characteristics of that order of productions. As such, it ought to vindicate the order from some portion of the abuse with which it has lately been the fashion to visit it. The newspaper and magazine gentlemen who are so anxious that sermons should be shorn of their natural proportions, being made as short and as thin as possible, may here find that a long and weighty pulpit discourse may be written without any resort to the *bunkum* with which they appear to be so familiar. The three heads, which have been especially objected to, confront us in all their glory, and yet one cannot desire a change to *one*, strongly recommended as that is, any more than to four.

Perhaps the part of this sermon which is most elaborately executed is that devoted to the exposition of what Mr. Beard calls "a scientific theology." Certainly the question thus opened is discussed with unusual felicity, and under an evident sense of its special importance. It is from this part that we shall take the only specimens we give.

How well this contrast is put!

"A clergyman finds, after turning his back again and again upon unwelcome evidence, that the Bible is not what he has thought it to be from the day at which he first opened it for himself: he bows his head in speechless sorrow; the very sunlight is darkened to his eyes; the foundations of the world reel beneath his feet. A chemist gathers up indications of fact which less watchful eyes would have passed by; pursues for months a patient track of investigation; arrives at last at the certainty of a law which corrects many ancient misconceptions; and, if he be a devout man, blesses God with his whole heart that he has been chosen to reveal this mystery of creation."—P. 10.

How forcibly this conclusion is drawn!

"Not the least important element in this conception is the thought, that as there is but one God, so but one Truth; that not only is God's word Truth, but all Truth, of whatever kind, God's word; that as God is the Infinite Being, by and of and in whom all things exist, all knowledge which the human mind is capable of receiving combines to form one sublime theology, one all-comprehensive doctrine of God. And from this lofty point of observation a host of lesser distinctions, which seen from a lower level have a validity of their own, melt into nothingness: secular and sacred, natural and supernatural, general and special,—these are but epithets to describe different manifestations of the one pervading force which radiates through all existence from the central will of the Eternal. So, too, it seems to be no more than a concession to human feebleness of conception to speak of sciences; there is but one science, illimitable in height and depth and breadth; one infinite yet homogeneous Truth; the knowledge of God, the constancy of His will, the multiplicity of His ways. Every newly-discovered law is one more manifestation of His steadfast purposes; every newly-observed phenomenon, a fresh occasion of insight into the method of His administration. It is not for me to attempt to trace the way in which this great principle shall finally be applied to refine the materialism of modern science, and to seat the all-perfect God on the throne of adoration which philosophers reserve for impersonal Law or inexorable Fate. My faith in its final victory rests on the simple but sure foundation of my theistic belief: in the world of nature, as of grace, 'God is His own interpreter,' and when His time is, will make all mysteries plain." P. 20.

There is a sentence which, as it stands, needs correction in a subsequent edition. Instead of, "Except when Luke desires to fix the date of Christ's birth," &c., as on page 6, we should read, "Except to fix the date of Christian facts, the name of no Roman emperor is found in the New Testament."

One final recommendation we have to offer. We could wish our readers to place this sermon before their orthodox friends. We are persuaded that, so used, it will in an eminent degree serve the cause of Christian charity and progress. It breathes that deep religious feeling which is more likely to win to our sympathies those whose faith now alienates them from us, than can be done by any mere statement and enforcement of doctrinal truth.

INTELLIGENCE.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, CARMARTHEN.

The annual examination took place on Tuesday the 18th and three following days, before the Revds. Dr. Sadler and Mr. Marshall, and Alderman J. C. Lawrence, as a deputation from the Presbyterian Board, with the assistance of Rev. J. E. Jones, of Bridgend, and Rev. E. Higginson, of Swansea.

The examinations were, speaking generally, satisfactory, reflecting credit upon the students and honour through them upon the thoroughness with which they are taught. On Friday morning the annual distribution of prizes was made, and an affectionate and able address delivered to the students by Dr. Sadler in conclusion.

As we are enabled to print the questions which formed the examination for Mr. Sharpe's theological prizes, we may mention that the first (£6) was gained by Mr. E. C. Edmonds, who last year carried the the second, and the second prize of £4 was gained by Mr. Jonas Evans.

We must not omit to mention the most *conspicuous* novelty in the late examination, namely, the improvement that has been made in the college-buildings since last summer. The Board having purchased the premises, the roof has been raised and renewed, new windows have been put in, and a fine large room contrived for library and common hall. Both externally and internally, the building has now a thoroughly academic air. It is chiefly to the energy and practical ability of Alderman Lawrence that the College is indebted for these improvements; and to his generosity it further owes the addition to the library of a beautiful oriel window commanding the lovely valley of the Towy. A considerable number of ladies were present on the Friday morning, the enlarged accommodation for the first time making this pleasant addition practicable.

Questions for Mr. Sharpe's Prizes.

1. At which towns was the apostle Paul driven by the Jews to leave the synagogues and to preach in a neighbouring building?

2. Which Epistles do you judge from the internal evidence to have been written before he received such ill-treatment from the Jews? and which after he had left off attempting to preach in the synagogue?

3. What Roman emperor was the Cæsar mentioned in Matthew xxii.? Who is the Cæsar of Acts xvii. 7? Who is the Cæsar of Acts xxv.? Who is Augustus of Acts xxv. 25? Who is Cæsar Augustus of Luke ii. 1?

4. What passages in the Gospels and in the Epistles say that the expected Messiah is to be without known genealogy?

5. The first three Gospels say that the Last Supper of the Saviour was a Passover Supper; but the fourth Gospel says that it was eaten several days before the Passover. Give the reasons which may be found for relying on either statement.

6. What traces have we in the New Testament of the Lord's Supper being changed from a real meal to a ceremony which was not meant to satisfy hunger?

7. Divide verses 2—5 of Solomon's Song, chap. i., into the speeches of a dialogue between the bride and her attendants; the four verses seem to contain ten speeches.

8. Where in the map are the Syrian kingdoms mentioned in the books of Samuel; namely, Damascus, Zobah, Hamath and Geshur? Where are Tiphsah and Tadmor? Where is Elath?

9. By whom and on what remarkable occasion was the Canaanite town of Gezer conquered?

10. In Exodus xxiii. 16, the Feast of Ingathering, when the harvest was over in September, is said to fall at the end of the year; but in Leviticus xxiii. 39, it is said to fall in the seventh month. Which of these two is according to the earlier and which the later of the two Jewish calendars?

11. Who is the king of Assyria mentioned in Ezra vi. 22? And who the Assyrians mentioned in Numbers xxiv. 24?

12. Quote passages in the Old Testament which prove that other solemn days were called sabbaths beside the seventh day of the week.

13. About what time of year was the day called by Horace, Tricesima Sabbata?

14. Compare Satan in the Book of Job with the Lying Spirit of 1 Kings xxii.; the Satan of the Book of Revelation; the Serpent of Genesis, chap. ii.; the Devil of the Gospels; the Demons of the Gospels, mistranslated Devils; the Dragon and his angels of Rev., chap. xii.; and state the agreement and the difference between each.

15. Reduce into English measures and money the price of corn mentioned in Rev. vi. 6, and in 2 Kings vii. 1, and compare them both with our present price in this country.

16. When our Saviour says to Peter, Matt. xvi. 19, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in

heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,"—to what passage in Isaiah does he allude?

17. Enumerate some of the chief points of the Jewish Law in which the book of Deuteronomy differs from the former books of the Pentateuch.

18. What is the meaning of επι το αυτο in the following places: Acts i. 15, Acts ii. 1, Acts iii. 1?

19. What is the meaning of κατα το αυτο in Acts xiv. 1?

20. What is the meaning of ισος in Mark xiv. 56, and of ισοτητα in Coloss. iv. 1?

21. What is the difference between αληθης and αληθινος in the New Testament?

22. The Emperor Tiberius came to the throne on the 18th August, A.D. 14; on what day did the 15th year of his reign begin, according to the civil reckoning at that time in use in Judea and the rest of the East?

23. What is the meaning of a star being εν τη ανατολη, according to the Greek astronomers? See Matt. ii. 2.

24. What is the meaning of the sun's παραλλαγη, according to the Greek astronomer? See James i. 17.

25. To whom can we point with any probability as "the brother whose praise is in all the churches," mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 18—24?

26. Which are the words pointed to as "this scripture" in Acts i. 16?

27. What is the difference between ἡ ἁγια, the singular, Heb. ix. 2, and τα ἁγια, the plural, Heb. ix. 24 and x. 19?

28. What is the difference between ὁ ουρανος, the singular, and οἱ ουρανοι, the plural, usually in the Testament?

29. What is the difference between γαμος, the singular, in Matt. xxii. 8, and γαμοι, the plural, in xxii. 3?

30. What was the probable age of the daughter of Herodias when she danced before the guests on Herod's birthday?

31. At what time in the year was the Jewish fast mentioned in Acts xxvii. 9?

THE PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY.

On Thursday, June 20th, the annual meeting of the Provincial Assembly was held at Hyde chapel, Gee Cross, Cheshire. There was a very large attendance of ministers, delegates and friends from all parts of the two counties of Lancaster and Chester. Among the visitors present we observed Mr. Travers Madge, the Rev. Dr. Davidson, formerly Principal of the Independent College in this district, and the Rev. Dr. Gottheil, the rabbi of the reformed congregation of British Jews in Manchester.

The service began at 11 o'clock. The Rev. J. Gordon conducted the devotional service with earnestness and devoutness, and the Rev. S. A. Steinthal preached an interesting and suggestive sermon from 1 John iii. 14. After the sermon a collection was made on behalf of the missionary branch of the Assembly, which amounted to £16. 17*s*. 4½*d*.

Before proceeding to business, an interval was allowed for the exchange of mutual greetings and salutations by the friends who were gathered together from such widely-separated districts. The Rev. C. Beard took the chair. The Rev. J. T. Whitehead, the Secretary, then read the roll, and a much larger number of ministers and delegates answered to their names than in previous years. There seemed to be very few congregations which had not sent delegates.

After this roll-call, the Chairman, in a few appropriate and well-chosen words, alluded to the pleasing fact that this year we had no deaths of ministers to record, and then offered a welcome to the Revds. Mr. Brock and E. Smith, who had settled in the province during the year. In the absence of Mr. Brock, the Rev. E. Smith responded.

Rev. F. Baker proposed, and Mr. R. D. Darbishire seconded, a vote of thanks to the preacher and supporter for their excellent services. The motion was unanimously adopted. The Rev. gentlemen briefly replied.

Rev. S. F. Macdonald moved the appointment of the general Committee for the ensuing year.—Mr. Ashton seconded the motion, which was, as usual, adopted.

The papers were then sent round for the election of a supporter for the next annual meeting: the Chairman shortly announced that the Rev. J. Drummond had been elected.

In the absence of Mr. H. A. Bright, the Rev. John Wright read the report of the missionary branch of the Assembly. It was a most hopeful and cheering document, and gave evidence of the successful accomplishment of much valuable work. The East Cheshire branch reported an income for the year of £92. 18*s*. 10*d*., the East Lancashire of £252. 18*s*. 1*d*., and the Manchester district of £404. 7*s*. 9*d*. A number of new stations had been opened, old congregations revived, and a generally healthy spirit developed. It was intimated that preaching was about to be commenced by the Liverpool branch at Southport, and the Committee recommended that something should be done at Blackpool and in

the Lake district. The report was listened to with marked attention, and produced a considerable effect upon the Assembly. It was unquestionably the most striking and satisfactory part of the day's proceedings.

Rev. H. Green, in moving that the report be adopted, and printed and circulated under the direction of the Committee, said, he esteemed it his good fortune to have to propose a resolution which only needed to be read in order to be approved by that numerous assembly. The report itself, to which they had just listened, and listened to with great pleasure, was its own best argument. Having been so long connected with this part of the kingdom, he could look back to a period when the question of missionary work was first discussed in these two counties, respecting the formation of a missionary branch of this Assembly, and having been present at the first meeting held for this purpose, he could not but contrast with great pleasure, and he might add great religious gratitude, the meeting of that distant day and the meeting assembled here. It was very rejoicing to them as they grew older to see plans that received the approbation of their youth growing in favour. He never in his youth had expected that they should agree together so cordially and work together so harmoniously as they were doing in behalf of the missionary branch of the Assembly. He most cordially proposed the resolution.—Mr. Peter Eckersley seconded it, and it was carried unanimously.

Rev. S. A. Steinthal moved, and the Rev. G. H. Wells seconded, the names of the Committee of the missionary branch for the ensuing year.

In the absence of Mr. Ainsworth, through indisposition, the Rev. J. Colston read a brief report from Cleator, expressing satisfaction with the services of the past year, and asking for a continuance of them in the coming year. Mr. Colston moved, and Rev. J. Gordon seconded, the re-appointment of the Cleator Committee. The resolution was adopted.

Mr. R. M. Shipman then, in a long and elaborate speech, moved that a Committee be appointed to consider the question of ministers' salaries, with a view to ascertain the best mode of promoting a general and large increase thereof.—Mr. Lamport seconded the motion. Mr. R. D. Darbishire, the Revds. Henry Solly, John Gordon and J. Robberds, took part in the discussion which ensued. Ultimately the resolution was adopted, and a Committee appointed.

Rev. Chas. Beard then gave notice of a motion that a special meeting of the Provincial Assembly be held next year to celebrate the bi-centenary of the withdrawal of the glorious Two Thousand.

It was resolved that the next meeting be held at Chowbent. A vote of thanks to the Chairman closed the proceedings.

The friends then adjourned to the spacious and handsome school-rooms recently erected by the Hyde congregation, where a plentiful collation was prepared, and of which a large number partook. It seemed a pity to make a charge of three shillings each for this collation; for though a large party availed themselves of it, yet it acted as a barrier to many of our less wealthy friends who were not able to pay so large an amount for a single meal.

After the collation, Mr. Thomas Ashton, J.P., took the chair. As the first toast, he gave the usual loyal sentiment, "The Queen."—Rev. Wm. Gaskell next spoke with unwonted fervour and power on "Civil and Religious Liberty all the World over."—To the next sentiment, "The Provincial Assembly," the Revds. C. Beard and F. Baker responded, the former in an eloquent and powerful speech, the latter in an interesting statement connected with the history of the Assembly.—Rev. John Wright responded to "The Missionary Branch of the Provincial Assembly." In a vigorous and eloquent speech, he pointed out the kind of good which the various missions had done.—To the next sentiment, "The East Cheshire Missionary Association," Rev. John Gordon spoke with great power and unction.—Rev. S. A. Steinthal spoke to the sentiment of "Domestic Missions."—Dr. Beard responded in an earnest and eloquent speech to the "Widows' Fund."—Mr. R. D. Darbishire spoke of "The Manchester New College," and Mr. I. Mackie of "The Home Missionary Board."—To the sentiment of the "Honorary Members of the Assembly," Mr. Travers Madge spoke in a few simple, earnest and touching words; and Rev. Dr. Davidson very briefly but feelingly responded to the toast of "The Visitors."—Mr. Ivie Mackie having taken the chair, votes of thanks were given to Mr. Thomas Ashton and the Hyde congregation. The meeting terminated about half-past seven o'clock.

Upon the whole, the day's proceedings were exceedingly interesting, an earnest spirit was manifested, differences were forgotten or laid aside, and there seemed a general consciousness that there was so much to do that there was little time for mere talk. There were probably one or two matters upon which a strong difference of opinion was felt by various members of the Assembly, one or two subjects were perhaps treated a little too slightingly, but the good sense of all prevented dispute.

Only let there be good, useful work done, and few will complain of other things. A unity in labour is always fruitful of the highest good.

SERVICES AT THE OLD PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL, HALL BANK, BUXTON.

June 16. Rev. J. Page Hopps, Sheffield.
23. Rev. Abram Lunn, Chorley.
30. Rev. Wm. Elliott, Doncaster.
July 7. Rev. William Robinson, Blackburn.
14. Rev. C. W. Robberds, Oldham.
21. Rev. Edwin Smith, M.A., Manchester.
28. Rev. G. B. Brock, Hale and Altrincham.
Aug. 4. Rev. M. A. Moon, Stannington.
11. Rev. E. W. Hopkinson, Manchester.
18. Rev. Geo. Hoade, Newchurch, Rossendale.
25. Rev. Wm. Binns, Birkenhead.
Sept. 1. Rev. J. Harrop, Manchester.
8. Rev. J. Cropper, M.A., Stand.
15. Rev. J. K. Montgomery, Chester.
22. Rev. J. Rushton, Padiham.
29. Rev. George Fox, Mossley.

Morning service at eleven o'clock; evening service at half-past six o'clock.

THE WEST OF ENGLAND AND SOUTH WALES UNITARIAN BOOK AND TRACT SOCIETY.

The seventieth annual meeting of this Society was held at Bath on Wednesday, June 19th. More than fifty of the Bristol congregation were present; there were also visitors from Taunton, Bridport, Trowbridge, Cheltenham, Warminster, Reading, Tiverton, &c. The first part of the service at the chapel was conducted by the Rev. C. H. A. Dall, Unitarian missionary from Calcutta; and the Rev. Thomas Madge, of London, preached an admirable and most appropriate sermon from Ezek. xviii. 29, "Are not my ways equal?" At half-past five o'clock there was a large gathering at the Assembly Rooms. After tea, Thomas Jolly, Esq., the Mayor of Bath, took the chair, and commenced the usual proceedings. He congratulated the large number of friends present on their having come together to celebrate the seventieth anniversary of the Society; described its object and means used for its promotion; and then referred to other incidental benefits arising from the operations of the Society. It called them together on such occasions as the present; they thus made a public profession in the face of the world of their being a body of Unitarian Christians: this might help to encourage the timid, give courage to waverers, and lead others to inquire into the real opinions of Unitarian Christians.

The Mayor then called upon Mr. Staples, the Secretary, to read the annual report, which stated that since the last annual meeting forty-nine new members had been added to the Society; and that in the course of the year between five and six thousand books and tracts had been issued from the depository. The report also urged the great importance of tract distribution as a means of disseminating the truth. On the motion of Thomas Colfox, Esq., seconded by the Rev. H. E. Howse, the report was unanimously adopted. Thanks were voted to the officers and committee of the past year; and then Jerom Murch, Esq., proposed that the warm and cordial thanks of the meeting be presented to Mr. Madge for his truly excellent and powerful sermon delivered in the morning. He spoke of the delight with which, five-and-thirty years ago, when residing in London, he used to go to Essex-Street chapel to hear Mr. Madge, and concluded by expressing an earnest hope that the remaining days of the venerable preacher may be cheered by witnessing fresh triumphs of the truth which he had so nobly advocated, and by the blessing of that God whom he had so devoutly worshiped. The motion was warmly seconded by Thomas Laing, Esq., of Bristol. Mr. Madge responded with much feeling, and earnestly called upon the friends around him to hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering; to stand up like men in its defence, and never to yield to intimidation or to slavish fear. He hoped the time was coming when men would be ashamed of the moral cowardice which was now too often witnessed, and which led many to play truant with their own principles, and to break faith with their own hearts.

Rev. W. J. Odgers, in the name of his congregation and the other friends present, offered a cordial welcome to Mr. Dall, as an American, as a Unitarian minister, as a missionary, and referred to the great events now taking place in America,—to the writings of American Unitarian authors,—and to the labours of Mr. Dall in India. Col. De l'Hoste seconded the motion; to which Mr. Dall replied in an address which was listened to with much interest. Other sentiments were responded to by Rev. W. James, Rev. R. C. Jones, of Bristol, Rev. W. A. Jones, of Taunton, Rev. H. E. Howse, Rev. Robert Gibson, Christopher Thomas, Esq., John Worsley, Esq., and others. The proceedings of the evening were enlivened at intervals by appropriate

singing and music; and after a cordial vote of thanks to the Mayor for his kindness in presiding on this occasion, the Rev. Thos. Madge closed the meeting with an appropriate prayer. It might be truly said of this meeting, as of a former meeting of the same Society held in the same building (see Christian Reformer, 1841, p. 587), that it was "a meeting at which the pious and venerated founders would have devoutly rejoiced, presenting as it did scenes *which they longed to see, but could not.*"

OBITUARY.

THE REV. EDWARD HALL.

The March obituary of the *Reformer* recorded the death of this excellent man and faithful minister, which took place at Beeston, near Leeds, on February 15.

During his last illness, Mr. Hall expressed a desire that some slight sketch of his early life might be published. He was anxious that his friends should know the difficulties with which he had to contend, and the many unfavourable circumstances which surrounded him in his youth. He hoped that his example might encourage young men placed as he had been, by shewing them how much may be accomplished with the smallest external advantages, by an earnest desire for self-improvement.

Such particulars of his early history as could be gathered together are now presented without comment, and without any attempt to weave them into a formal narrative. The materials are slight in themselves, but they suggest very impressively the lesson which our friend hoped they might teach.

Mr. Hall was born in Hampshire, of very humble parents. He was one of eleven children, and was the eldest son. His father had received no regular education himself when young, but he was not insensible to its value, and determined to do his best to secure the blessing to his children. Accordingly, Edward was sent to the parish school as soon as he was old enough, and there made rapid progress in reading, writing and arithmetic. The education given in a country school some 35 years ago could hardly have been of a very high order; and as soon as the boy was able to earn anything, his father's necessities compelled him to remove him. His opportunities, therefore, of learning were of the humblest kind. He attended the Sunday-school, however, and became a pupil in the first or minister's class, and was remarkable for the quickness of his answering. He also seems to have been a pupil in a night school for a time.

As a lad, he had the character of being bold and persevering, clever at his work, and also mischievous and somewhat violent in temper. A disagreement with his father led to his leaving home at about the age of 18, and going to live in lodgings. For some time there was an estrangement between the two.

At about this period of his life, curiosity probably led him to attend a camp-meeting of the Primitive Methodists, and there (as his brother describes it) "the Word of God took hold of him." He was powerfully impressed by the sermon which he heard on this occasion (preached by one Edward Bishop), and dated from that hour the commencement of his religious life. A companion, who knew him well in those days, says that he had shewn him the very trees under which he knelt when "he obtained peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord." A great change seems to have passed over his life at this time. A reconciliation with his father followed, and the latter seems to have been powerfully affected by his son's religious influence.

Mr. Hall now became an earnest member of the Primitive Methodist church, a "prayer-leader" and "exhorter," and ultimately a lay preacher. He seems to have discharged the duties of this office with great fearlessness and fidelity. "He would sometimes preach," says his brother, "where other preachers were afraid to brave the storm, for at that time Primitive Methodist preaching was very much persecuted" in that neighbourhood. Sometimes he would visit the parish in which he was at school, and on one occasion is said to have been brought before the rector and curate in the chancel of the church to give account of himself for preaching without authority. After a time he was sent out as home missionary, and subsequently became itinerant preacher.

Gradually, however, a change was taking place in his religious views, and he became an Unitarian before he knew that there was a body professing the opinions which he had adopted. The unjustifiable conduct, as he deemed it, of the superintendent under whom he acted, was the immediate cause of his leaving the Methodist connection, but under any circumstances he could not have remained in it

much longer. Happily, at this juncture, he met with a valuable friend and counsellor in the Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge, who very kindly invited him to his house and gave him the use of his library. With Mr. Martin he remained for some time, preparing himself under his instruction for the Unitarian ministry, enjoying the benefit of his sympathy and advice, and occasionally occupying his pulpit. On leaving this excellent man he became minister successively at Billingshurst and, we believe, at another small place in Sussex. But being desirous to secure some further theological training, he resigned his pulpit and placed himself under the care of the Rev. B. Mardon, of London, with whom he studied for a time. In order to meet the expenses attendant upon this change, he was obliged to sell the furniture which he had gathered about him, and, no doubt, to practise much self-denial beside.

From London he removed to Leeds, and entered upon that ministry to the poor which for ten years commanded his best energies, and closed only with his death. He entered upon the charge of the Holbeck Domestic Mission at a critical period in its history, and succeeded, by his perseverance, fidelity and practical wisdom, in making it a blessing to the district in which its operations are conducted. He was a conscientious and unostentatious worker, and enjoyed in an eminent degree the respect and confidence of the people.

Shortly before his death he had resigned his office, but had consented to conduct the business of the Mission until a successor should be appointed. The Mill-Hill congregation marked their appreciation of his long and faithful services by raising a sum of money as a testimonial, which, however, had not been presented at the time of his death. He died at the age of 41.

Nothing need be added to these simple but impressive facts, which speak for themselves. The Rev. Samuel Martin, who knew Mr. Hall well, and whose testimony all will respect, says of him in a letter embodying some of the foregoing particulars—"He was a good man: 'an Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile.' He was my son in the faith, and I always loved him." H.

April 25, near Prescot, Mr. George Fogg, the youngest son of the late Rev. P. W. Fogg, of Ormskirk, aged 49. He had resided in Prescot more than 33 years, and was the principal supporter of the Unitarian chapel in that town. From being an apprentice-boy, he rose, by steadiness and attention to his business, to be one of the leading shopkeepers in the town, and after being 20 years in the drapery business, was about to spend the remainder of his days in retirement at Southport.

Finding his health declining, he remarked that he must seek a place where he might die, and not where he might live. After being five weeks in Southport, he was ordered by his medical advisers to leave the sea-coast, as the air was too keen for him; and he breathed his last on the 25th of April, attended by several of his most attached friends.

Since Christmas, he had placed a monument in the Prescot chapel-yard to the memory of an esteemed friend, the late Henry Procter, son of the late Rev. Mr. Procter, and the last Sunday he was at the chapel he witnessed the arrival of the monument there. Mr. Fogg was much esteemed in the town of Prescot. He was kind to his mother in her declining days, and most affectionate to his sisters and other relatives.

He was interred by Rev. Alfred Hardy, on April 29th, in the Ormskirk chapel-yard, where nine of his brothers and sisters, besides his parents and some other relatives, are buried. An impressive funeral sermon was preached on the Sunday following by the Rev. Alfred Hardy at Prescot.

May 26, at Aberdeen Park, Highbury, Bessie, the beloved wife of Charles Falcon, Esq.

May 30, at Bangor, aged 36 years, Ellen, second daughter of Mr. Robert Leigh, of Worsley.

THE LATE MISS BAKER, OF NORTHAMPTON.

This eminent and excellent lady, whose death was recorded in our last number, was a sister of the late George Baker, Esq., author of the History of Northamptonshire, whom she survived some years. The brother and sister were of similar tastes and pursuits, devotedly attached to each other, and were never separated until they were divided by death. The gifted sister shared so much in her brother's pursuits, literary, antiquarian and philanthropic, that it would be impossible to speak of her without recalling to memory the labours and virtues of her estimable and accomplished brother.

During the greater part of his life, Mr. Baker was engaged upon the History of the County,—an imperishable monument of literary industry, wonderful for the immense labour bestowed upon it, and the minute accuracy for which the author was

so distinguished. As the work was compiled in a great measure from the family archives of the nobility and gentry, and from the public records, of Northamptonshire and the neighbouring counties, the author was under the necessity of making frequent visits to these sources of information, and in all his excursions Miss Baker was his constant companion and a most valuable helper, for which her activity of mind and habits of observation eminently qualified her. She was also skilled in drawing, and etched with her own hand many of the plates for her brother's voluminous work. It is worthy of record that the department of botany and of natural history in general for the County History was, if not entirely, certainly in a great measure, her contribution. She did not, however, confine her researches to these objects, but was ever at work collecting every kind of interesting information, especially if relating to Northamptonshire. "In the progress of my visits through the county," she writes, "I have never failed to collect the local customs, proverbial sayings, sports, pastimes," &c. These collections, the work of a quarter of a century, were published in 1854 under the title of "*Glossary of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases . . . to which are added the Customs of the County,*" a work which will increase in value and perpetuate her name. It will be acknowledged that her attempt "to add an acceptable link to the dialectical chain that binds our common language" was not in vain, and that the desire she expresses in the title-page will have been amply fulfilled :

I twine
The hope to be remembered in my line
With my land's language,

By noting, e'er they fade away,
The words and sports of yesterday.

In her knowledge and appreciation of church architecture, Miss Baker was scarcely inferior to her brother, and was elected an honorary member of the Northampton Architectural Society. To her, even more than to Mr. Baker, was due the restoration of St. Peter's church in their native town, referred to in the following words of a reverend and learned gentleman: "But let it never be forgotten that long before this [the Northamptonshire Architectural] Society was in existence, long before there was awakened in this country the enlightened appreciation of the great church works of our forefathers now so prevalent, before Glossaries were published and even Bloxam was an unknown name, there were a brother and sister in this town, dwelling under the shadow of St. Peter's, who, by their active vigour of mind and actual labour of hand, kept alive an interest in this church, and so, I verily believe, when no one else, even its appointed guardians, seemed to care for it, preserved perfect and intact those singular remains, the minutest carving of whose every stone there are hundreds now to appreciate."

In that church, at the western extremity of the aisle, may now be seen a mural tablet to the memory of Mr. Baker. A white scroll on a black marble slab bears the following inscription :

In memory of George Baker, Esq.
Born at Northampton, September 28, 1781.
Died October 12, 1851.
Fifteen years Magistrate of this Borough.
The historian of his native county.
Skilled in archæological and mediæval learning.
An early and zealous promoter of the restoration of this Church.
An active supporter of benevolent institutions.
Unwearied in his efforts for the moral and intellectual advancement of his fellow-men.
Distinguished in private life by his urbanity, kindness and affection,
and by the humility and faithfulness of an earnest Christian disciple.
His remains are interred in the family vault
in King-Street chapel.

By the side of this, how appropriate would be a similar memento of the sister, whose mind and heart were, equally with her brother's, devoted to every good object, public and private, in which he was interested! How active a part she took in the establishment and support of educational and charitable institutions in her native town is well known. She may be said to have been one of the founders of the Lancastrian and British Schools there, of the latter of which she was on the committee. She was also one of the ladies who established more than forty years ago the first clothing club in that town, and for the last three years she was lady-president of it. She was one of a committee of ladies for visiting the female prisoners in the borough goal, a member of a lying-in society, and a subscriber to various other charities.

Although Miss Baker was not aged, she could remember events which we are accustomed to think of as dating a long time back. She well recollected being taken by her parents, when yet very young, to hear John Wesley preach in the open air on what was then called "The Green" at Northampton. The venerable figure of

that good man remained distinctly engraved on her memory ever after. She could also recall to mind the intense and tearful interest she felt, though but a child, when reading with her brother of the sufferings of the Royalists in the French Revolution; and she distinctly remembered seeing a troop of cavalry gallop down Gold Street on their way to Birmingham to suppress the riots from which Dr. Priestley suffered so much.

The Bakers were originally Trinitarians; but when, on the death, in 1827, of the Rev. John Horsey, minister of Castle-Hill chapel, a few of his congregation, who had imbibed the liberal sentiments inculcated by that worthy successor of Philip Doddridge, formed themselves into a separate society, Mr. and Miss Baker warmly sympathized with the movement, and supported it by their presence at the opening service, which was conducted by the Revds. Robt. Aspland, William Field and Chas. Berry, and by their subsequent regular attendance at the Sunday-evening services, though they did not entirely join the congregation until after the death of their own venerable and beloved pastor, Mr. Edwards, of King-Street chapel.

Their firm attachment to the principles they held, both political and religious, is well known; and it is pleasing to record that they did not thereby lose the friendship, but gained the esteem, of those who differed from them most widely. It is difficult to know which to admire most, the pure love of truth which induced them to avow unfashionable sentiments at a time when they moved in the first circle of society in the county, or the truly Christian charitableness and respect, and the undiminished friendship, ever shewn towards them by Churchman and Dissenter, Conservative and Liberal, Peer and Commoner.

W. D. J.

In a former No. we recorded the death of Rev. Joseph Hunter, F.S.A., one of the Assistant Keepers of the Public Records. He was born at Sheffield, Feb. 6, 1783. Of his parents some particulars were penned by their gifted son, who cherished with an affectionate tenacity everything relating to his relatives and ancestors. Mr. Michael Hunter, his father, was in his 13th year left an orphan. He was fortunate in finding a guardian in Rev. Joseph Evans, the Presbyterian minister of Sheffield, a man of great amiability, intelligence and moral worth.

Mr. Michael Hunter was educated at the schools of Rev. Daniel Lowe, of Norton, and Rev. Mr. Dawson, of Idle, having in each school as his associates the flower of the youths of Dissenting families in that part of the kingdom—the Shores, Oateses, Naylors and Turners. He was next apprenticed to a Sheffield manufacturer, and became in time a manufacturer of Sheffield cutlery. But his fortunes were not advanced by his connection with the trade of his native town. In his 23rd year he married Elizabeth Girdler, a lady described as "one of the most amiable of human beings, pure in her tastes, elegant in her manners and lovely in her person." Of three children born to Michael and Elizabeth Hunter, Joseph alone survived. Mrs. Hunter died in 1787, aged 25. The orphan son was adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Evans. He himself has narrated, in a most interesting manner, this part of his life, and described the religious and other influences by which his childhood and youth were moulded:—"I had been accustomed from my earliest infancy to be very much at the house of Mr. Evans, who, as well as Mrs. Evans, entertained an affection for their ward (Mr. Michael Hunter) which was almost parental, and who were most affectionately attached to my mother. All this affection at length centered strongly upon me, and induced them, having no children, and having recently lost their only nephew, to take upon themselves the entire care of me. I was formally adopted by them, lived ever thenceforth with them, and was treated in all respects as their child. Indeed, recalling the days now long passed and friends now long buried, I remember with affection and gratitude his care, which was more than paternal, and her love, which was more than a mother's love. Their adoption, as they often told me, was according to the Roman custom, and only wanted the legal forms, because the English constitution had not, like the Roman, provided for the case. It was ratified by the consent of all parties interested in both families, and in a manner of peculiar solemnity, the two sisters of Mrs. Evans especially expressing their full concurrence. I could know little or nothing of what was going on, for I was only five or six years of age; but I have now in my possession the costly memorial which was prepared at the time, with the attestations of the four parties on the side of the adopting family, and those of my father and my mother's mother, of an event to which in due time I should be awake to the importance. But I did not go to them a little motherless child, taking nothing with me. I carried with me the family portraits, the plate and other little articles of value which had been about the house, and there followed me something more substantial than these. After all his losses,

there still remained to my father one of the properties bequeathed to him by my grandfather. It consisted of a piece of land near the market-place in Sheffield, on which were six small houses which had been built by my grandfather and great-grandfather, and three more of a better kind which had been recently erected by my father. . . . . From the time when I was adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Evans, I had much less intercourse with my father than children usually have. . . . . I was thus myself, from the age of six, a member of two families, one by birth and the other by adoption. I know not to which the respectful regard of the child ought rather to be directed, for by both families I was treated with the utmost possible tenderness. It was the amiable character of my mother, and the affecting circumstance of her early death, that acted so benignly upon me. My early religious impressions I took from the family to which by birth I belonged, and I am not without indistinct recollections of what the 'Lois' and 'Eunice' of my family were to me. They infused into me the spirit, to them hereditary, of the persons whose names are written in this book.* They themselves came not behind the best of their religious ancestors; but my chief religious impressions I received from that which was my family by adoption. Both these, my second parents, were, like myself, of Puritan origin, sprung from those who had been ministers, confessors and founders. I was thus placed under the same influences under which I should have lived if I had remained with my own family, only they were stronger; for nothing could exceed the anxiety of Mr. Evans to bring me up in devoted attachment to the sect of which he was a most worthy minister. But it was to him more as a political than a religious institution. He thought exceedingly little of religious controversies and religious peculiarities.

"He had settled himself in a system early in life which underwent no change; but it consisted chiefly of the very simplest truths. His religion was to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly, to cultivate the habit of devotion, to realize the constant presence of one great and good God, who knows all our thoughts, and who will one day call every man to account. He detested above all things pretensions of religion where the morality was not pure, and a main object of all his public and private instruction was to beat down all reliances where men cannot come into the presence of their Maker with a clean hand and a pure heart. He regarded the instructions of Jesus Christ as the best rules of life; he received him as a teacher sent from God. He had no uncertainty respecting the gospel miracles, and he built his hope of a resurrection on the resurrection of our Saviour from the dead. His life was one of continual devotion and active charity."

After reading these autobiographical extracts, the reader need scarcely be told that Mr. Hunter ever cherished towards his friend and parental guardian, Mr. Evans, and his excellent wife, sentiments of the highest esteem and tender affection. At a proper age he was placed at the school of Mr. Sorby, at Attercliffe, near Sheffield. On quitting school he was placed in a commercial house in his native town, that of Mr. Hatfield, in which he continued for several years, but with no growing taste for the duties connected with trade. He looked back upon this portion of his life as wasted time, and once attributed, in a conversation with the writer a year or two before his death, his being apprenticed to trade as one of the mischiefs resulting from Mr. Locke's advice in his "Thoughts concerning Education"—that every gentleman should "learn a trade, a manual trade; nay, two or three, but one more particularly." When speaking of this, there was an asperity manifested towards the name and reputation of Mr. Locke, as if he felt that the great English philosopher had actually wronged him. But his youthful days in Sheffield were by no means lost time. He had thus early developed those tastes for genealogy and local history which he subsequently cultivated with such marked success.

Even in youth "he devoted (we quote now a passage from the obituary in the last No. of the *Gentleman's Magazine*) all his leisure moments to the study of such works as he could procure upon historical, topographical and genealogical subjects, and to copying all monumental inscriptions and similar remains to be met with in the churches of the vicinity: he thus laid the foundation of that minute acquaintance with the family history of his native town and neighbourhood, of which he afterwards made such good use. Many volumes yet remain of church notes taken by him at this early age."

The next step in his life, his entrance as a student of divinity in the college at York (then recently removed from Manchester), was one far more congenial to his

* The extracts are taken from "Gens Sylvestrina; Memorials of some of my Good and Religious Ancestors, or Eleven Generations of a Puritan Family. By Joseph Hunter."

wishes than his connection with the trade of Sheffield had been. He was equally fortunate in finding a tutor of rare accomplishments and of varied excellence. The Rev. Charles Wellbeloved was his tutor, and his companions were Mr. Madge, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Henry Davies, Mr. John Woodhouse Simpson, Mr. Griffith Roberts, Mr. Robberds, Mr. Sydney Shore, Mr. Astley, Mr. Turner, Mr. Dean and Mr. James Yates. In a very pleasing but too brief memoir inserted in the third No. of the *Unitarian Herald*, the latter gentleman says that Mr. Hunter and his companions at York "were united in a feeling of attachment to their friend and tutor, Mr. Wellbeloved, and had a most delightful and improving intercourse among themselves. At their convivial meetings, Mr. Hunter's discreet judgment and cultivated taste gave a decided bias to the current of conversation and the tone of thought."

"The course (we again quote from the *Gentleman's Magazine*) prescribed to the students at this College was remarkable for the attention given to minute verbal criticism of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures: this branch of study was peculiarly suitable to Mr. Hunter's cast of mind, and he retained a lively interest in these questions long after abandoning the profession which first led him to them."

On the completion of his college course, Mr. Hunter spent a short time at Norwich, where he temporarily supplied the pulpit vacated by Rev. Pendlebury Houghton.

In the following year he accepted an invitation of the Presbyterian congregation of Bath to become their minister, in succession to Rev. T. Broadhurst. He remained here about twenty-four years. His strictly professional duties did not exclusively occupy his attention. But it must not be supposed that he neglected his ministerial functions. His preparation for his Sunday duties was always made with exact care; and an intelligent hearer, who had benefited many years by his services, stated to the writer that she never heard him preach an indifferent sermon; there was always sterling morality expressed in sterling English. His delivery and general pulpit manner were, it must be admitted, formal and somewhat cold. During his ministry at Bath, though by no means forward in promoting schemes of Unitarian action, he did not decline at the call of duty to take his place, both at Bath and elsewhere, at the annual meetings of the Western Unitarian Society. In the year 1816, he preached before this Society an excellent sermon, designed to shew that scripture is the guide and delight of the Unitarian Christian. This sermon was afterwards printed, and, if now withdrawn, was long a useful tract in the depository at Bristol. His first publication had preceded, being an admirable sermon for the General Hospital of Bath, abounding in just thoughts, illustrated by striking historical facts, and expressed in very felicitous language. It is entitled, "The Ameliorated Condition of the Poor one Benefit derived to the World from Christianity."

One other sermon Mr. Hunter printed in 1813, containing a tribute to the memory of the Rev. John Simpson, a member of the Trim-Street congregation, and the ingenious and learned author of "Essays on the Language of Scripture" and various other theological works. How unreservedly Mr. Hunter was in his theological convictions at this time a Unitarian, appears from a passage in his sermon relating to the doctrinal views of Mr. Simpson.

During his residence in Bath, "he continued his collection of materials for the history of his native town, part of which he embodied in his 'Hallamshire,' published in 1819. This was followed by two volumes of the History of the Deanery of Doncaster in 1828 and 1831. He was moreover forward in the promotion of every scheme adapted to increase the then commencing interest in the history and antiquities of our country, and was one of the original members of the Bath Literary and Scientific Institution, which is still a flourishing establishment. He was a valued member of that 'Stourhead Circle' of which he afterwards printed some account,—a party of gentlemen residing in the counties of Somerset and Wilts, who year after year met under the hospitable roof of Sir Richard Colt Hoare, of Stourhead, to compare the progress they had made in those studies which had an interest for them all.

"Mr. Hunter's intimate acquaintance with ancient writings and with the minuter details of our history, attracted the attention of the then existing Commissioners of the Public Records, who determined to secure to the country the services of one so well qualified to assist in the work with which they were charged. Accordingly Mr. Hunter, being appointed a sub-commissioner, removed to London in 1833, and entered on the duties of his office at the Midsummer of that year. His employment was at first editing various volumes of record-learning to be hereafter mentioned. On the re-construction of the Record Service in 1838, he was appointed an Assistant Keeper of the First Class, and to his care were committed the Queen's Remembrancer's Records, with the especial duty of forming a Calendar of this vast

mass of miscellaneous documents. From the day of its commencement till almost the day of his death, this calendar was always in his thoughts; and whatever might be his other employments, he never allowed them to interfere with the prosecution of the great work committed to him, and to the completion of which he looked forward as the reward of his persevering toil. His family frequently heard him, during his last illness, express his satisfaction that he left behind him, in Mr. Walter Nelson and Mr. Joseph Redington, two gentlemen who, having for many years been his assistants, were perfectly trained in his mode of proceeding, and competent to bring to perfection the work in which he had made so much progress. We are glad to see that the former gentleman has been appointed to succeed Mr. Hunter in his office of Assistant Keeper of the First Class.

"Soon after Mr. Hunter's removal to London, much of his attention was occupied by a suit in Chancery, well known as the 'Hewley suit,' in which it was sought to take from the Unitarians the benefit of property left by Lady Hewley in the early part of the eighteenth century, and which she destined for the support of the Presbyterians, to whom she herself belonged. The fact seems to be that the Presbyterians had ceased to exist as a distinct body, a few of their members having joined Independent or other Dissenting congregations, while the mass had insensibly passed through Arian to Unitarian doctrine. Mr. Hunter allowed that those who at the time of the suit enjoyed this property, denied many doctrines which the foundress regarded as a fundamental part of Christianity; but he maintained that the Unitarians, historically speaking, represented the foundress, and that, had she then been living, she would have been an Unitarian herself. The Courts of Law, however, decided in favour of the new claimants; when the Dissenters' Chapel Act was passed to prevent stale claims of the kind being made for the future, by making twenty years' use sufficient proof, in the absence of written expressions of intention, as to the doctrines to be taught in any chapel. It is clear that, had this statute existed, the claim of the Independents could at no time have been successfully urged, for no considerable change of doctrine took place within the limits of any period of twenty years.

"Numerous as Mr. Hunter's works are, they represent but a small part of the labours of his evenings and vacations. It was a principle with him to print nothing of any new discovery while any hope remained of finding further illustrations of it. It results from this that much curious information remains in his manuscripts which he had not the time or opportunity to work up to the perfection at which he aimed; and he has left behind him a vast mass of manuscripts relating to all the subjects which engaged his attention.

"Much of Mr. Hunter's time in middle life was devoted to the illustration of the text of Shakespeare's Plays. His genius led him to endeavour to correct what was faulty, and to throw light on what was obscure in the text, rather than to the psychological school of criticism introduced by Coleridge. He published two works, containing part of the results of his labours in this direction.

"In connection with his Shakespearean studies we may mention the collections formed by Mr. Hunter towards lives of English verse-writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; these he never published, although, in a tract he printed on the ancestry of Alexander Pope, he intimates an intention to do so. We may conclude that he has left a portion at least of this work in a state of forwardness for publication.

"We must not neglect to notice Mr. Hunter's discoveries in relation to the first settlements of New England. His work on this subject attracted great attention in America, and brought the author into correspondence with very many gentlemen of Boston and other cities of the United States, who felt an interest in tracing the first beginnings of their Commonwealth. Many of these printed for private circulation accounts of what, with Mr. Hunter's assistance, they were able to gather of the early history of their families; and we believe that he possessed a very extensive collection of volumes of this character.

"Our space does not allow us to notice more of Mr. Hunter's contributions to the minute historical literature of his country. Many of his communications will be found in the *Archæologia*, and among the Papers read at the annual meetings of the Archæological Institute. In consideration of his contributions to the former series, he was honoured with the title of Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries.

"Mr. Hunter relaxed nothing of his constant attention to the studies he loved, even while labouring under the painful malady which at last overcame him; after more than two years of suffering he sank under this disease on the 9th of May, 1861. He was interred at Ecclesfield, a village in the neighbourhood of Sheffield, in a spot chosen by himself some time before his death.

"In 1815, he married Mary, daughter of Francis Hayward, M. D., of Bath; by her, who died in 1840, he had six children, of whom three sons and a daughter survive him." *(Gentleman's Magazine.)*

In reference to the state of Mr. Hunter's opinions during the later portions of his life, it has been in some quarters concluded that because one of his sons was brought up as a clergyman, he himself had abandoned the Nonconformist and Unitarian ranks. This does not necessarily follow. But it would be uncandid not to admit that latterly his sympathies were not given, as of old, to his early religious associates, or if given to them personally, were denied to their opinions. Mr. Yates has stated the matter thus: "The position of a Dissenting minister does not appear to have suited him. Towards Independents and all orthodox Dissenters he entertained sentiments of alienation, if not of contempt. At the same time he had no sympathy with the Unitarian tendencies of his own denomination. He rather regarded the change introduced by the activity of such converts as Priestley and Belsham as an irruption of the enemy. He preferred the dignified uniformity, the graceful tranquillity, the inward peace, the blameless morality, and the assiduous, unostentatious beneficence of the same class of Dissenters as they were represented in former times by Mr. Evans and his contemporaries."

According to his own statement, made in a work written towards the close of his life, Mr. Hunter was disposed to rest acquiescently in the great outlines of practical religion, paying little heed to doctrinal and denominational lines of separation. "After a life of some continuance, I return very much to the state of my early instructors, and would say to my posterity, FEAR GOD AND KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS, FOR THIS IS THE WHOLE DUTY OF MAN. And I see not but that this may be attained by following the great wheel of the Church, reformed and unreformed, as well as by striking out into bye-paths of our own, where we must necessarily find ourselves, if we think at all, beset with doubts respecting the propriety of our course; and if trusting to our own powers, we extend our inquiries to the great truths of religion, to the occasional suspension and to the permanent diminution of that spirit of faith by which Christianity chiefly works to produce the results of holy thoughts and charitable deeds—peace, quietness and assurance for ever."

Among the works of Mr. Hunter, we are disposed to record our particular value of the Life of Oliver Heywood, published in 1842. It is singularly rich in details respecting the early Nonconformists of the north of England, details to be found in no other printed form. It is not creditable to the Nonconformists of England, that a work so valuable and interesting as this has not in the course of nearly twenty years reached a second edition. The latest work which Mr. Hunter committed to the press was his "Account of the Society of Separatists at Scrooby, the Founders of New Plymouth," an enlargement of one of his short series of Antiquarian Tracts. It is, in its more perfect form, a masterly specimen of antiquarian sagacity and successful perseverance in unearthing minute details respecting a distant age and men generally forgotten. We cannot conclude this gathering of facts and opinions relating to a good and very able man, without adding that, notwithstanding some peculiarities and infirmities of temper, he was very true to his personal friendships, and to serve a friend would encounter labour and make sacrifices of time and his own tastes. There are many who, in common with us, treasure his letters, full of curious information, and preserve now with a mournful interest the recollection of his conversation, enriched as it was with all the stores of biographical, genealogical and antiquarian lore.

June 5, at Penrith, the Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, D.D., in the 88th year of his age.

June 10, at Headingley Hall, Leeds, MARIAN, wife of Thomas Wolryrche STANSFELD, Esq., in the 31st year of her age.

June 16, THOMAS FOX LEWIN, Esq., of Haverstock Hill, and the Corn Market, Mark Lane, aged 64.

June 17, at Backbarrow, North Lancashire, Mrs. AINSWORTH, in her 35th year.

MARRIAGES.

June 4, at Holywood, by Rev. Dr. Montgomery, uncle of the bride, J. TODHUNTER, Esq., to AGNES, youngest daughter of A. MONTGOMERY, Esq., Crumlin, Antrim.

June 22, at Dean-Row chapel, Wilmslow, by Rev. J. Colston, THOMAS SCHOFIELD to MARY, only daughter of Mr. John HANKINSON, farmer, Dean Row, Cheshire.